

A CLEAR  
ACCOUNT  
OF THE  
Ancient Episcopacy,

PROVING  
It to have been PAROCHIAL,  
and therefore inconsistent with the  
present Model of DIOCESAN  
EPISCOPACY.

WHEREIN THE  
Several Pretensions for the *Divine Right*  
of the Latter are fully examin'd.

AND *John Law*  
Mr. BOYSE's Sermon concerning the  
SCRIPTURAL BISHOP, and the Postscript  
to it are defended against Mr. DRURY's *Vindi-*  
*cation of his Answer to it.*

To which are added,  
Some Reflections on Mr. *Whiston's* Citation of *Clemens's*  
Epistle, in Favour of the [pretended] *Constitutions of*  
*the Apostles*; shewing that from their Disagreement  
upon this Head of Episcopacy, those *Constitutions*  
plainly appear spurious.

L O N D O N :

Printed for John Lawrence, at the *Angel* in the *Poultry*, and  
Path, Cliffe and Daniel Jackson, at the *Bible* and *Three*  
*Crowns* near *Mercers-Chappel*. 1712.



A C C O U N T

OF THE  
PROCEEDINGS  
AT THE

MEETING OF THE  
SOCIETY OF  
THE

THE

AND

SOME

L O N D O N

the  
turn  
and  
had  
all  
and  
a  
non  
Di  
Di  
Hu  
W  
for  
ha  
ob  
ne  
to  
pr

---

---

THE  
PREFACE.

**M**R. B. has already in the Postscript to the Sermon concerning the Scriptural Bishop, given an Account of the Reason of its being publish'd among several other Miscellaneous Discourses. 'Tis the Scriptural Episcopacy describ'd in that Sermon of his, and further vindicated in his Postscript that I have undertaken the Defence of, against those that allow of no other Episcopacy but the Diocesan, and who fix that on no lower a Claim than that of a positive Divine Right. The Controversy does not therefore lie with those moderate and judicious Divines of the Establish'd Church, who ascribe Diocesan Episcopacy to no higher Original than Humane Institution. For their Principles no Way oblige 'em to nullify the Ministry of those Reformed Churches either at Home or Abroad, that have not the Diocesan Form of Government, nor obstruct their Desires and Endeavours after a nearer Coalition with 'em. The Antagonists I have to deal with in this Cause, are only such as assert the present Episcopal Form of Government, (which

is no other than Diocesan ) to be of Divine Institution, and who plead a positive Divine Authority for appropriating the Powers of Excommunication and Ordination to Diocesan Bishops, to the Exclusion of all others from 'em. And no Man that is conversant in the Writings of the late Defenders of the Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy, can doubt of the unhappy Tendency of their Principles, to cool their Charity towards many of the Reformed Churches Abroad, and to extinguish it towards the Protestant Dissenters at Home, and even towards the whole Church of North-Britain, where a different Form of Church-Government has a Legal Establishment. Concerning the last of these, viz. The Church of North-Britain, the Expressions of Dr. Hicks are very remarkable : \* “ Such a Church ( saith he ) “ I think altogether as unworthy of the Name of “ a Church, as a Band of Rebels in any Coun- “ trey who have overthrown the Civil Constitu- “ tion of it, wou'd be of the Name of a King- “ dom, State, or Republick. Because such a “ pretended Church is not only a Variation from “ the Catholick Apostolick Church, but a sworn “ destructive Confederacy against it. Even the “ Abomination of Desolation in the House or “ Kingdom of God. Of which their Pastors are “ not Ministers, but by Principle most malicious “ Enemies ; not Pastors, but Wolves of the

---

\* See Preface to his Answer to the Rights of the Christian Church, p. 200. Publish'd since the Union,

## The PREFACE.

v

“Flock.” A Censure that argues as little Respect to the Laws by which the Union is establish’d, as it does of Charity towards that Church, whose present Form of Government is thereby ratify’d in North-Britain. And therefore to refute such Principles as lead Men to such uncharitable Censures, is so far from having any Tendency to widen our unhappy Differences; that ’tis rather a necessary Step towards promoting that mutual Charity and Union of Affection, that shou’d be found among all that agree in the great Principles of the Reformed Religion, though under different Terms of Ecclesiastical Government. But what Charity can we expect from those that declare all Ordinations that are not perform’d by Diocesan Bishops null and void, and all the sacred Ministrations of such Pastors utterly invalid? Nay, what Charity can we expect from those late Bigots, whose flaming Zeal prompts ’em not only to consign all Protestant Dissenters as damnable Schismatics, to the Lake of Fire and Brimstone, with the Devil and his Angels, but to send all those of their own Communion, to the same Place and Company, who have more charitable Thoughts of ’em, and are desirous of a more near and comprehensive Union with ’em?

And when we come to enquire into the Reason of this strange Uncharitableness, we find, ’tis not founded on any Difference in the Doctrinal Articles of Religion (unless that of unlimited Non-Resistance must pass for one:.) Nor on meer Disagreement in the external Modes of Worship; (for distinct Churches may have their different



Rites.) But 'tis chiefly founded on this groundless Opinion, that Diocesan Episcopacy is of positive Divine Right, and so necessary to the being of a Church, that there can be no valid Ordinations, and consequently no valid Ministry without it.

And since this is the Opinion I have undertaken to shew the Weakness of, I must desire the Reader once for all to observe, that this Dispute is no Way concern'd with Diocesan Episcopacy, as it is any Part of our Legal Constitution, nor with those Laws by which it is Establish'd among us. I have not once meddled with the Debate, how far the civil Powers may model the External Government of a National Church, or confine the Powers of Excommunication and Ordination to any particular Order of Men in it? But only, Whether God himself has by his own Authority confin'd these Powers to Diocesan Bishops, and thereby not only barr'd all Civil Powers from Establishing any other Form of Ecclesiastical Government, but rendred any other Form utterly unlawful; nay, null and void? 'Tis certain, That if we may in this Point rely on the Judgment of Dr. Stillingfleet, our Legislature had no regard to the Affirmative of this latter Question in the Establishment of Diocesan Episcopacy. " I doubt not (saith he, Irenic. p. 385.) to make it evident, That the main Ground for settling Episcopal Government in this Nation, was not accounted any Pretence of Divine Right, but the Convenience of that Form of Church Government, to the State and Condition of this Church  
at

# The PREFACE. vii

*" at the Time of its Reformation." As far as I can pretend to understand our Laws, they are so far from supposing the Diocesan Form of Church-Government to be of Divine Right, that they rather suppose the Spiritual Jurisdiction of our Diocesans consider'd as such, to be deriv'd from the Crown. Mr. B. had to this Purpose in the Postscript, alledg'd that Clause pass'd in the First of Edward the Sixth, that affirms all Authority and Jurisdiction Spiritual, to be deriv'd and deducted from the King's Majesty, as Supream Head of these Churches of England and Ireland. This Clause is every Way conformable to what is more largely inserted in the 37th of Henry VIII. c. 17. And tho' this Act of Edward VI. was repeal'd by 1 Mary, c. 2. yet it was reviv'd by 1 Jac. I. c. 25. This indeed Mr. Dr.— tells Mr. B. " If it refer to the Jurisdiction of the*  
*" Bishops Courts, is no more to the Purpose or*  
*" Business in Debate, viz. Whether Bishops and*  
*" Priests were distinct Offices by Divine Appoint-*  
*" ment, than if Mr. B. had formally and gravely*  
*" told him a Story out of Reynard the Fox, or*  
*" the Seven Wise Masters." For the Wit of this*  
*Comparison, I shall not meddle with it, being little*  
*acquainted with the Learned Treatises Mr. Dr—*  
*mentions : But for the Reason of it, 'tis what I*  
*am less able to comprehend. Mr. B. had shewn*  
*him from a Paper publish'd in the Reign of*  
*Henry VIII. with the Stamp of Royal Authority*  
*(intituled, The Erudition of a Christian Man) that*  
*it was affirm'd, " That the Scriptures only make*  
*" express mention of Two Orders, Priests and*

“Deacons” *This was conformable to a Declaration made in the same Reign, by the King’s Vicar-General, and several Bishops and Doctors, wherein they assert, “That in the New Testament there is no mention made of any Degrees or Distinction of Orders, but only of Deacons or Ministers, and of Priests or Bishops. The Reader will find the genuine and obvious Sense of those Passages vindicated in the following Remarks. And to these Priests and Bishops, those Two Papers suppose the Powers of Excommunication and Ordination committed by the Apostles. What then can be more naturally infer’d from those Acts of Parliament, that affirm all Spiritual Jurisdiction in the National Church to be deriv’d from the Crown, than that the appropriating these Powers of Excommunication and Ordination to Diocesan Bishops, as distinguish’d from Priests, and the confining this Spiritual Jurisdiction to the Latter in the National Church, was owing to the Regal Authority (to which they reckon’d it did belong, to model the National Form of Church Government) and not to any Divine Institution, (the New Testament having mention’d no such Distinction of Orders.) And as this renders these Clauses in our Acts of Parliament fully consistent with what those Two foremention’d Papers assert, and justifies the Remark that Dr. Heylin makes on that particular Clause i Edward VI. So if this be the genuine Sense of ’em, let the Reader judge, Whether Mr. Dr.’s putting off the Argument with so trifling an Answer, looks not much more like telling a formal and grave Story*



Story out of the Authors he is pleas'd to refer to ?

*And that some of the greatest Divines that ever flourish'd in the Establish'd Church ascrib'd this Diocesan Episcopacy to no higher Original than Ecclesiastical Custom, and were far from condemning those Churches that wanted it, as guilty of violating any Divine Institution, I have in the following Remarks made good against Mr. Dr——'s Exceptions.*

*And whereas there is no Topick that the late Assertors of the Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy, more plausibly insist on for the Defence of it, than that of its being the ancient Government of the Church from the Apostle's Time, I thought it the more necessary (since Mr. Dr—— insisted so much on it) to give a clear and satisfactory Account of the Primitive Episcopacy.*

*That some such Distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter did early obtain in the Christian Church, as is now found among us between the Rector of a Parochial Church and his Assistant-Curates, I shall freely grant. And no Wonder, that as the Ancients did early make Two Degrees of the Deacon's Order or Office, viz. the Deacons and Subdeacons ; so they made Two such Degrees of the Pastoral or Priestly Order or Office, viz. Bishops and Presbyters, the Bishop being in his Congregation or Church the First or Chief Presbyter, that was principally entrusted with the Pastoral Oversight of it, his Fellow Presbyters being his Colleagues and Assistants therein. And if the Episcopacy that obtain'd in the Second and Third Centuries*



# The PREFACE.

*tries, was no other than this I have now describ'd; if any Argument for a Divine Right, were to be drawn from the early Practice of the Ancient Churches, it must be only to prove, that some Superiority of a Parish-Rector above his Assistant-Curates, is of Divine Institution. But, who does not at first View see, how utterly insufficient this is to prove the Divine Right of the present Diocesan Episcopacy? The Matter of Fact stands thus; every Church or Congregation that had its Communion-Table, had its Bishop and Presbyters, (i. e. its Rector and Assistant-Curates.) This Bishop did chiefly (tho' not solely, but in Conjunction with his Assistant-Presbyters) exercise the Powers that are now call'd Episcopal, viz. Those of Excommunication, and Absolution, and Ordination. Let us for once suppose the Argument good from Matter of Fact, to Matter of Right, and allow this as a Matter of Divine Right; Will it hence follow, That 'tis a Matter of Divine Right, that many Scores or Hundreds of these Congregational-Bishops or Parochial-Rectors, together with their Assistant-Presbyters, shou'd be depriv'd of these Episcopal Powers, and they shou'd be now entirely engrossed in the Hands of a single Diocesan for whole Province? And that the Government of many of these ancient Episcopal Churches, shou'd be put down to erect the Plan of a Diocesan One?*

*How strange and unaccountable is it then, to find the Generality of those that write on this Subject, so constantly confounding this Parochial with Diocesan Episcopacy, as if they were the same Thing,*

## The PREFACE.

xi

*Thing, when the Latter (as I have shewn in these Remarks,) is so utterly inconsistent with the Former, and so entirely subversive of it! And if this Primitive Parochial Episcopacy be all that's contended for, I think the Dispute about the Divine Right of it may be laid aside. For even those who think the Primitive Church had as little of any Divine Authority to plead for subdividing the Deacons, as the Priestly or Pastoral Office; wou'd yet be so far from opposing, as to rejoice in the Restoration of this Ancient Parochial or Congregational Episcopacy. And perhaps there cou'd be no better Expedient for accommodating these Differences, than the restoring these Parochial Bishops to their ancient Rights, and such a due Limitation of the Superintendency of Diocesan ones (who seem to answer the Metropolitans of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries) as may render it cumulative to, and not destructive of the ancient Powers of these Parochial Bishops. This the learned Archbishop Usher made some Attempt towards, in his excellent Model for the Reduction of Episcopacy. And perhaps a few Strokes added thereto from Primitive Antiquity, wou'd render that Model more beautiful, as well as more practicable.*

*And I am not out of all Hope, That Mr. Dr—— himself will fall in with it, if he will stand to his own Concession, That the Extent of the Bishop's Charge, is no Way essential to his Office. For then I am sure it wou'd be no Way destructive of Episcopacy, to reduce it to its ancient Parochial or Congregational Bounds. Whereas the Appropriation of what he calls Episcopal Powers to a Diocesan*

cesan, does manifestly overthrow the whole Scheme of that Primitive Parochial Episcopacy, on which this Gentleman founds his Argument for the Divine Right of that which now obtains. So just is the Bishop of Sarum's Observation, That the enlarging of Dioceses, (i. e. of the Extent of the Bishop's Charge) has quite alter'd the Figure (he might as properly have said the very Species and Kind) of the Primitive Episcopacy. The Platform of the Diocesan being rais'd on the Ruins of the ancient Parochial Episcopacy.

Till therefore the Evidence I have produc'd for the Ancient Episcopacy's being only Parochial, and of the Parochial Bishop's having tho' the Chief, yet not the Sole Hand in the exercise of what are now call'd Episcopal Powers, be clearly disprov'd, I hope this formidable Argument from Antiquity will be dropp'd. For it now bears hardest on those that have so long, and with so unusual an Air of Triumph made their boast of it.

And indeed the clearing this Point, casts so great a Light on the whole of this Controversy, as has render'd the Answer to all the rest of Mr. Dr——'s Book an easy Task, the main Strength thereof relying on this imaginary Conformity between the ancient and the present Episcopacy. And if the Reader meet with too frequent a Repetition of this in the following Remarks, he must blame Mr. Dr—— that has render'd it so necessary to distinguish these two inconsistent Things which he at every Turn confounds.



## The PREFACE. xiii

*I shall detain the Reader no longer from 'em than to acquaint him, That as I have been impartial in my Search after Truth in this controverted Subject, So I have endeavour'd to defend it with that Candor and Calmness that are suitable to it. If I have run into any considerable Mistakes that affect the main Cause I plead for, I am willing to receive better Information from any charitable Hand. But if I meet with Antagonists that instead of a solid and distinct Answer, only employ their Critical Talent to carp, or their Passions to rail at these Papers, I shall not think my self concern'd to take Notice of 'em.*

*'Tis probable, That Mr. French, Mr. B's other Antagonist, may expect that I shou'd give a particular Reply to his Defence of the Answer to the Sermon. But I must desire to be excus'd, for Reasons which tho' they may not appear satisfactory to him, will I hope appear so to all impartial Readers. I am not willing after the Treatment Mr. B. met with from him ( so unbecoming the Character of a Clergyman ) to furnish him with a new Set of Collections, when he has made no Acknowledgment of the Insincerity and gross Prevarication he was so fully convicted of in those which he publish'd, and which were so industriously dispers'd at the Parliament Doors in Ireland. Nor am I desirous of encountering a Man that has shew'd such an extraordinary Skill in criticizing upon Mr. B's poor harmless Expressions, as he has done in his Elaborate Pamphlet, entituled ( for what Reason he I suppose knows, for no one else can guess ) Partiality detected*



tested. Besides, tho' I might plead the Proverb on my Side, of, Ne Hercules quidem contra duos; yet I believe the Reader will find little of any Moment in Mr. Fr——'s Defence, that is not answer'd in the Remarks on Mr. Dr——. And I believe it will be readily own'd by all impartial Judges, that in entering the Lists with the Latter, I have not in this Cause declin'd the stronger Antagonist to grapple with the Weaker. I take Mr. Dr—— to have said the most that the Cause will bear. Of what weight it is, I must leave the Reader to judge, when he has perus'd the following Remarks.

An Appendix is added in Relation to some Things in Mr. Whiston's late Performance: Which was thought the rather advisable; both for the Sake of the Argument, since the Sentiments of Clemens Romanus, and the Apostolical Constitutions are largely insisted on in the Body of this Book; and also on Mr. Whiston's own Account, who 'tis hop'd upon Second Thoughts will lower his Opinion of those Constitutions, when he considers the manifest Inconsistency between Clemens and them in this particular.

The

The EDITIONS of some ancient  
Writers of the Christian Church referr'd  
to in these Sheets, are as follows ;

**C**lementis Romani Epistola prima ad Corin-  
thios. Ex Edit. Joan. Clerici, inter Patres  
Apostolicos, Fol. Antwerp. 1698. Vol. 1.

Hermæ Pastor. *Ibid.*

Constitutiones Apostolorum. Et Canones Apo-  
stolorum. *Ibid.*

Ignatii Epistolæ. *Ibid.* Vol 2.

Polycarpi Epistola. *Ibid.*

S. Justinii Philosophi & Martyris opera, Græco-  
lat. Fol. Lutet. Paris. 1615.

S. Irenæi contra omnes Hæreses Lib. 5. Ex Edi-  
tione Joan. Ernesti Grabe. Fol. Oxon. 1702.

Clementis Alexandrini Opera, Gr. lat. Fol. Lutet.  
1629.

Q. Septimii Flor. Tertulliani Opera. Ex Priorii  
Editione. Fol. Lutet Paris. 1664.

Origenis in Sacras Scripturas Commentaria, Gr.  
lat. per P. Dan. Huetium. Fol. 2 Vol. Colon.  
1685.

Origenis Adamantii Opera, latinè, per Erasmus.  
Fol. 2 Vol. Basil. 1536.

S. Cæcili

- S. Cæcilii Cypriani Opera**, recognita & illustrata a *Joanne Fello*, Episcopo Oxoniensi. Fol. Editio tertia. *Amstel.* 1700.
- Eusebii Pamphylî Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ**, Lib. 10. Ex Editione *Henr. Valesii*. Fol. *Paris.* 1659.
- S. Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera**. in 2 Tomis. Ex Editione *Morelli*. Fol. *Paris.* 1630.
- S. Epiphaniî Opera**, Gr. lat. in duos Tomos distributa, per *Dionys. Petavium*. Fol. *Colon.* 1682.
- S. Johannis Chrysostomi Opera**, Gr. per *Henr. Savil.* Fol. in 8 Tomis. *Etonæ.* 1613.
- S. Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis opera**, per *Desider. Erasmus* emendata, in 9 Tomos digesta. Fol. *Paris.* 1546.

Besides these, 'tis fit to mention the Edition of a modern Book, the Author has frequent Occasion to refer to; viz. *Dr. Stillingfleet's Irenicum*. 4to. 2 Edition. *Lond.* 1662.

# THE CONTENTS.

*REMARKS on Mr. Drury's 1st Chapter. Of the Judgment of the First Reformers concerning the Distinction by Divine Right between Bishops and Presbyters,* Page 1.

**T**HE Testimonies produc'd by Mr Boyse for their Identity vindicated, p. 1. No Evidence that the First Reformers chang'd their Mind in this Matter, p. 7.

*Whether asserting their Identity serves the Cause of Popery more than the contrary Opinion does.* p. 8. Archbishop Whitgift, the Bishops Morton and Jewel, Dr. Willet, and Dr. Reynolds against the Distinction Jure Divino, in Queen Elizabeth's Time, p. 11. Dr. Reynolds's Letter against Bancroft on this subject recited, p. 13. Bishop Bedel of the same Judgment, p. 19. Dr. Bancroft himself allow'd the Validity of Ordination by Presbyters, p. 19. Archbishop Usher of the same Mind, p. 20. M. Dr—— misrepresents the Sentiments of the Reformed Churches Abroad, p. 21.

*REMARKS on Mr. Drury's II. d. Chapter. Of the Judgment of the ancient Fathers upon this Question,* Pag. 22.

Mr. Dr—— unduly charges Mr. Boyse with confining a Minister's Office to a particular Congregation. Not the Power, but the ordinary Exercise of it so confin'd, p. 22. Mr. Dr——'s Concession that Diocesses and Parishes are not of Divine Right, proves Diocesan Bishops not to be so, p. 27. Of the Distinction between a different Order, and a different Degree in the same Order, p. 29. Mr. Dr—— reminded what he must prove to serve his Cause by the Fathers, p. 30.

*Whether*



Whether the Fathers assert Bishops to be by Divine Appointment, p. 31.

Clemens Romanus, Mr. Dr——'s first Witness. All the Passages in him relating to this Argument recited, p. 32, &c. Mr. Dr——'s Allegations from him in favour of Episcopacy particularly examin'd, p. 41, &c. The Author's Five Arguments from him against the Divine Right of Episcopacy, p. 56, &c.

Ignatius, p. 63. The Debate whether his Epistles are genuine wav'd, p. 64. All the Passages in his Seven Epistles relating to this Argument recited, with two Marginal Columns, applying his Words in the one to a Diocesan, in the other to a Parish-Bishop; that the Reader may observe which Paraphrase is most natural, p. 66, &c. Reflections on these Passages under Three Heads. 1. Who the Ignatian Bishop was, whether the Pastor of a single Congregation or of many such, p. 86, &c. 2. What Difference Ignatius supposes between this Bishop and his Presbyters; whether any Distinction of Office, p. 93, &c. 3. Some genuine Inferences from his Testimony, p. 106, &c.

Hermas. A Passage in him mention'd by Mr. Dr——, proves not any Distinction between Bishops and Presbyters, p. 111.

Heraclas's Testimony reaches not the Question, p. 113.

Justin Martyr, p. 114. Allow'd that he makes some Distinction between the President (or Bishop) and the Presbyters. But his President only the Pastor of a single Congregation. Dr. Maurice's Evasion answer'd, p. 115.

Tertullian, p. 116. He gives no Intimation of any but Congregational Bishops, p. 118. The Sense of one Passage of his explain'd by Polycarp's Epistle, p. 121.

Origen. The Passages Mr. Dr—— cites from him, neither prove Bishops and Presbyters of different Orders, nor the Bishop to be any more than Congregational, p. 122. In some Places he expressly makes only two Orders in the Church, p. 123.

Clemens Alexandrinus. His Testimony, when recited more at large, makes against Mr. Dr——'s Hypothesis, p. 124.

Sir P. K——'s Reflection on it, p. 125. Elsewhere he mentions only two Orders, p. 126. A dubious Passage in him considered, p. 127.

Constitutions of the Apostles, and Apostolical Canons. Several Testimonies cited thence, p. 128, &c. Reflections to prove that the Bishop mention'd in the Constitutions, must have been only a Congregational Bishop, p. 141, &c. Remarks on Bishop Fell's Parallel between the Election of the ancient Bishops and that of our present Diocesans, p. 144. The Canons also speak only of a Congregational Bishop, p. 148. Their forbidding Presbyters to ordain considered, p. 149. The Author's Thoughts about the Date of these Writings, p. 150.

Cyprian.

**Cyprian, p. 152.** *That his Church was but one single Congregation argued,* 1. *From his utter Silence about more Congregations under his Charge,* p. 153. *Dr. Maurice's Pleas to the contrary answer'd,* p. 155, &c. 2. *Because he supposes two Readers he had ordained capable of being heard by the whole Church,* p. 158. 3. *Because his whole Church commonly join'd in the Eucharist,* p. 159. 4. *His whole Church were ordinarily present at Acts of Discipline,* p. 160. *Dr. Maurice's Evasion answer'd,* p. 161. 5. *He declares himself and the Bishops of those Times generally, to be chosen by all the People,* p. 162. *Dr. Maurice's Exception answer'd,* p. 164.

*What Distinction Cyprian intimates between him and his Presbyters.* p. 165. *Mr. Drury's Pleas from him for a Distinction of Office between them by Divine Right, answer'd,* p. 165. *Positive Arguments to prove that Cyprian apprehended no such Distinction between them,* p. 169.

*Short Remarks on some other Authors that Mr. Dr—— has slightly touch'd on; as St. Gregory Nazianzen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, and the Council of Chalcedon,* p. 172.

**S. Jerom. 173.** *Several Passages recited, where he gives his Judgment professedly in this Controversy,* p. 175, &c. *Evident from them all, that he asserts not only a Community of Names, but of Office between Bishops and Presbyters,* p. 181. *The Cavils of various Authors to the contrary distinctly answer'd,* p. 182—201.

**Reflections on all these Testimonies from Antiquity,** p. 201.

**For Matter of Fact,** *no Intimation of any Distinction before Ignatius's Time. Then Episcopal Churches only Congregational. Some few in the Third Century upon growing numerous had Chapels of Ease belonging to them, but still only one Altar,* p. 201.

**For Matter of Right,** *no Evidence of a Divine Right for any Superiority,* p. 203. *Much less for the Dependance of these Chapels of Ease on the Mother-Church, Ibid. And less still for the Dependance of many Parochial Churches on a Diocesan Bishop,* p. 204.

**Inferences from the Premises.** 1. *Even Parochial Episcopacy is but from Ecclesiastical Custom,* p. 204. 2. *If Parochial Episcopacy were granted to be Jure Divino, then Diocesan cannot be so, Ibid.* 3. *There is little or no Conformity between the Primitive Episcopacy and the present Diocesan,* p. 205. 4. *Those Reform'd Churches that want the Diocesan, retain the true Primitive Episcopacy,* p. 208. 5. *The main Controversy here truly is about the Extent of the Bishop's Charge,* p. 209.

REMARKS on Mr. Drury's III<sup>d</sup> Chapter. Of Three Ministerial Acts he would appropriate to Bishops as distinct from Presbyters, Pag. 211.

1. Of Excommunication. Whether the Bishop's peculiar. The Apostles did not appropriate it to themselves in their Life-time. 1 Cor. V. cleared and vindicated, p. 211. Nor left any Direction for confining it to Diocesan Bishops, p. 215. Nor did Parochial Bishops claim it solely to themselves, after there was some Distinction between them and their Assistant-Presbyters, Ibid. No Instance of their passing this Sentence in the Three first Centuries without their Presbyters Concurrence, p. 217.
2. Of Confirmation. Whether proper to the Bishop. Mr. Dr—'s Argument from the Apostles laying Hands on the new Converts, Act, 8. 14. consider'd, p. 218. That done for conferring extraordinary Gifts, not for Confirmation, p. 219. No such Ceremony in Scripture-times for conferring the Spirit's ordinary sanctifying Operations, p. 220. Admitting Persons baptiz'd in Infancy to adult Communion on Profession of their Faith, a Practice agreeable to the general Rules of Scripture. But the Modern Confirmation very different. In Antiquity, it was the Province of the Pastor of a particular Church or a Parochial Bishop, not a Diocesan, p. 220. It was administred immediately after Baptism, and by Mistake was judg'd a necessary Appendix to Baptism, p. 221.
3. Of Ordination. Mr. Boyle's Notion of Ordination, that 'tis only a recognizing of the Authority which is convey'd by Christ's Charter, defended, p. 222, &c. Mr. Dr—'s Pleas from Scripture and Antiquity, for appropriating Ordination to Bishops superior to Presbyters, answered, p. 231. Shewn, that if the Ancients had confined the Power of Ordination to their Bishops, it would not serve the Diocesan Cause, because theirs were Parochial Bishops, p. 232. But the Ancients did not exclude their Curate-Presbyters from the Power of Ordaining. Mr. Drury's Objections consider'd, p. 234, &c. Nor did they found the Restraint laid on these Presbyters from ordaining without their Bishops, on a Divine Right, p. 238. Mr. Boyle's Argument for Presbyters Power of Ordaining from 1 Tim. IV. 14. at large vindicated against Three different Pleas of Mr. Dr— p. 240, &c. Of the Chorepiscopi, p. 250.

REMARKS on Mr. Drury's IV<sup>th</sup> Chapter. Of Bishops being the immediate Successors of the Apostles, p. 253.

Whether the Apostolical Office were to continue always in the Church, debated. The several Parts of their Power enumerated. They have



# The CONTENTS

xxi

have Successors only in such Powers, which are not founded on extraordinary Assistances, p. 253, &c. They did not leave all their ordinary Powers to one Sort of Pastors, and only some of them to others, p. 258. The Addition of Matthias, Barnabas, and Paul, to the Number of the Apostles, no Service to Mr. Dr.—'s Cause, Ibid.

Whether Bishops are properly their Successors, p. 259. Mr. Dr.—'s Concession here, that the Extent of a Diocese is not essential to a Bishoprick, destructive of his Cause, p. 260. The Apostolical Office being call'd *'Eponem*, no Proof, p. 261. His Arguments from Antiquity consider'd, p. 262. From Irenæus, Ibid. Several Passages of his relating to the Successors of the Apostles recited, p. 263. That Author thought not Bishops a distinct Order from Presbyters. Mr. Dr.—'s Pleas to the contrary answer'd, p. 265. From Cyprian. He makes Presbyters the Apostles Successors as well as Bishops, p. 270. Jerome expressly does the same, p. 271.

Dr. Barrow's Seven Arguments against the Apostles having any proper Successors, vindicated, p. 272, &c.

**REMARKS** on Mr. Drury's Vth Chapter. Of unchurching the Reformed Churches Abroad, by asserting the Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy, p. 278

Mr. Dr.—'s Endeavour to evade this Consequence, utterly insufficient, p. 278. The same to be said of Dr. Synge's Consecration-Sermon, p. 279.

The foreign Churches are without the Diocesan Form, not from Necessity, but upon Principle. Prov'd particularly from their Confessions of Faith. Mr. Dr.—'s Pleas to the contrary, answer'd, p. 281. Though they are without this, yet they have the Scriptural and Primitive Episcopacy, p. 285. Mr. Dr.—'s Pretence of the Disparity between their Case and that of the Dissenters in England and Ireland, consider'd, p. 287. The Number of Foreign Churches destitute of Diocesan Bishops, not so inconsiderable as Mr. Dr.— would make it, p. 289.

Reflections on other Passages touch'd on in this Chapter. Mr. Dr.—'s Pretence, that tho' the Ancients speak of two Orders, yet they subdivided the superior into two more, High-Priests and Priests, consider'd, p. 291. Of the Censure past on Acrius, p. 292. Mr. Dr.— in his last Book has made his Scheme more of a Piece, but less defensible, p. 293. His Charge on Mr. Boyse of jumbling Independency and Presbytery in his Scheme, consider'd, Ibid.

RE-

**REMARKS on Mr. Drury's VIth Chapter. Of Mr. Drury's Scheme of Principles,** Pag. 294.

*Of the Apostles Successors in the Plenitude of their Power, p. 294. Whether they gave the whole of their ordinary Powers to one Order, and a Part of them to another, Ibid. The Absurdity of asserting the Government of the Christian Church to be after the Model of the Jewish Temple, and not of their Synagogues, p. 295. Whether the Twelve Apostles and Seventy Disciples, were of different Degrees in the Apostles Life-time, p. 297. Mr B——'s Argument against Three Orders from Eph. IV. 11. vindicated, p. 298. Mr. Dr——'s Assertion, that the Apostles before their Death invested some single Persons in every Church in the Government of it, farther invalidated, p. 300. Whether they planted Churches only in Cities, p. 301. How far they kept the Power of governing them in their own Hands when they were planted p. 302. Own'd to be true in Fact, that in After-times the City-Bishops made Churches gathered in the Country round them, their Diocesses, p. 304. But this denied to be of Divine Right, that upon an increase of Converts, new Congregations should be Chappels of Ease to the City-Church, and not under their own Parochial Bishops. Especially that many such should be made a City-Bishop's Diocess, 305. This the Spring of the first Deviations from the Simplicity of the Apostolical Age, p. 306. No Evidence that Epaphroditus was Bishop of Philippi, because he is call'd their Apostle, p. 307.*

**REMARKS on Mr. Drury's VIIth Chapter. Of St. James's being Bishop of Jerusalem.** Pag. 310.

*Mr. Dr—— pretends not to prove he had all the Christians at Jerusalem under his peculiar Charge, or that the Powers he claims to Bishops were solely exercis'd by him there; but only that some of the Ancients call him Bishop of this Place, p. 310. Undoubted that he was an Apostle: But whether he had his ordinary Residence at Jerusalem, uncertain and improbable, Ibid. If he had, this will not serve Mr. Dr——'s Cause, because 'tis uncertain, whether that Church consisted of one, or of several Congregations, p. 311. Mr. Dr——'s Assertion that the Country round was a Part of his Charge, is absolutely precarious, p. 314. Mr. Boyse's Arguments against his being properly Bishop of that City, vindicated, p. 315. The Fathers calling him by that Name may be accounted for, by his being Moderator of the Council of Presbyters*

# The CONTENTS.

xxiii

Presbyters there, p. 318. This Tradition of the Ancients founded on very uncertain Authority, p. 319.

## REMARKS on Mr. Drury's VIIIth Chapter. Of the [pretended] Bishopricks of Timothy and Titus, Pag. 320.

Evident indeed, that they were left, the one at Ephesus, the other at Crete for a Time: But in the Capacity of Evangelists. Mr. Boyse's Notion of an Evangelist vindicated, p. 321. Mr. Drury's confuted, p. 322. Whether the Powers exercis'd by Timothy and Titus were temporary, p. 323. Mr. B---'s Argument against their pretended Episcopacy, from their having no fixed Relation to those Churches as their ordinary Charge, vindicated, p. 326. Mr. Dr---'s Pleas for their being fixed Bishops there, consider'd. His Boast of the plain Evidence of Antiquity for it, retorted, p. 330. His Pretence from Bishop Pearson's Chronology of St. Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy, examin'd; and Mr. Owen's Arguments for its being written during St. Paul's First Bonds at Rome, vindicated, p. 332. Mr. Dr---'s Objection, that the same Works are not assign'd to the Elders at Ephesus as to Timothy, consider'd, p. 343. His Pleas for the Episcopacy of Titus, answer'd, p. 345.

## REMARKS on Mr. Drury's IXth Chapter. Of the Angels of the Seven Churches in Asia, Pag. 351.

Whether these were single Persons and proper Bishops. The Number of Authorities produc'd for this Opinion, might be easily ballanc'd with others to the contrary, p. 351. Mr. Dr---'s Arguments against the Pastors and Churches being comprehended under the Angel, not fully convincing, p. 352. Mr. Boyse's Proofs, that all the Teachers in each of the Churches are intended in the Title, vindicated, Ibid. If allow'd to be single Persons, it would not prove them Diocesan Bishops, p. 355. On whom the Blame is to be laid of the ill Success of the Savoy-Conference, p. 356. On whose Side there is most Temptation of Interest, p. 357.

## REMARKS on his Conclusion Pag. 357.

Of Blondel's Apology, Ibid. Of Grotius's Judgment in this Controversy, p. 358. Of Dr. Beveridge's Argument that Bishops are of Divine Right, because there are no Canons extant giving



giving them a Superiority over Presbyters, p. 359. Mr. Dr---'s Advice to Dissenters consider'd, p. 362.

An APPENDIX, containing Reflections on Mr. Dr---'s Preface and Introduction, and a Vindication of Mr. B. from some more personal Charges against him, pag. 365.

APPENDIX II. Remarks on Mr. WHISTON's Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions, in Relation to the Use he makes of Clemens's Epistle to countenance their Divine Authority. Pag. 381.

Mr. W. lays a principal Stress on the suppos'd Testimony of Clemens, and thinks him the Apostles Amanuensis in delivering these Constitutions, and that his Epistle was written after them, p. 381, &c. But that Clemens knew nothing of such Books evidenc'd— I. By considering Mr. W---'s Citations out of him, and shewing that none of them carry so much as the Face of a Proof that Way, p. 384. II. By comparing the Plan of Church-Government given us by Clemens, and that in the Constitutions, p. 388. Clemens's Account perfectly agreeable with the New Testament; the other not, p. 393. Some Questions hereupon propos'd to Mr. Whiston, p. 396.

## ERRATA.

PAG. 26. lin. 16. r. Guide. p. 33. l. 5. r. Affairs. p. 42. l. 29. r. far from distinguishing. p. 44. l. ult. dele; p. 49. l. 12. after Men dele; p. 97. l. 7. a fine. for and r. an. p. 111. l. 23. for in r. is. p. 177. l. 4. r. speaks. p. 189. l. 13. after Government dele; p. 205. l. 2. for Because r. Yet. p. 212. l. 25. r. Apostle. p. 237. l. 6. r. tells. p. 239. l. 25. r. a higher. In the Quotations at the Bottom of the Page. p. 74. l. 2. a fine. r. *overdressed*. p. 138. l. ult. r. VIII.

**Defence of Mr. BOYSE'S Sermon, con-  
cerning the Scriptural Bishop, against  
Mr. D R U R Y'S Vindication of his  
Answer to it.**

“an opinion was of our Power in Discretion”

Now tho' their Opinion it self will not determine the Cause, (Their *Authority* being no Way *decisive* in this Matter ) yet since it may be justly suppos'd, That if the chief Instruments of our Reformation did entertain the contrary Opinion, even tho' they were for continuing the present Episcopal Government, it was owing to the clear Evidence in which the contrary

B
Truth

Truth appeared to them from the Holy Scriptures, I shall offer something to vindicate the clear Instances Mr. B. had alledg'd for the Proof of it.

I shall only premise, That if any of the *Authors* Mr. B. had cited, appear at different Times to speak inconsistently with themselves, I am not accountable for that. 'Tis sufficient, That I prove what was their Opinion, when they expressly and publicly declar'd their Judgment in this Point in Dispute.

Mr. B. had cited to this Purpose, *The Declaration made of the Functions and Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests*, subscribed by *Thomas Cromwell* (then *Vicar-General*) the Two *Archbishops*, Eleven *Bishops*, and many other *Doctors* and *Civilians*.

In this *Declaration* they describe the *Spiritual Power* (as contra-distinguished from the *Civil*) as inclusive of the distinct Powers of *Preaching*, *Administring the Sacraments*, *Censuring* or *Absolving Offenders*, and *Ordination*. And then tell us, "That this Office, this Power and Authority was committed by Christ and his Apostles to certain Persons only; that is to say, to Bishops and Priests, &c. And they close their Declaration with these remarkable Words, "That tho' the Fathers of the Church had instituted other inferior Orders and Degrees, as Janitors, Lectors, &c. Yet the Truth is, That in the New Testament there is no mention made of any Degrees or Distinctions in Orders, but only of **DEACONS** or **MINISTERS** and of **PRIESTS** or **BISHOPS**.

To this Mr. Dr. — replies, That this Clause can do Mr. B. no Service; because the Offices of *Bishops* and *Priests* were so manifestly distinguished before.

*Ans.* I utterly deny, That in this *Declaration*, the Office of *Priests* and *Bishops* are manifestly distinguished before. Nor has Mr. Dr. — brought us any tolerable Evidence of it. On the contrary, the *Spiritual Power* (inclusive of the fore-mention'd Powers of *Teaching*, *Ministring the Sacraments*, *Censures* and *Ordination*) is evidently describ'd as one and the same Office, and not as two distinct Offices



Offices. And 'tis said to be committed to *Priests* and *Bishops*. There being not the least Intimation of this Office being by Divine Appointment parcell'd into Two distinct Offices, and of *Priests* being only invest- ed with *one Half* of the Spiritual Power, and the *Bishops* with the Whole. And the Passage Mr. Dr—— cites, wherein they tell us, *The Apostles commanded this Sacrament of Orders should be ministred by the Bishop to such as had the Qualities described*, III. Tim. does by no Means imply, that they thought the *Bishops* by Divine Right distinguish'd from *Priests*. For that wou'd be a flatt Contradiction to what they Assert in the Close of the Declaration, *That in the New Testament there is no mention made of any Degree or Distinctions in Orders, but only of Deacons or Ministers, and of Priests or Bishops*. Now if *Deacons* or *Ministers* be there *one* and the *same* Office, (both these Names signifying the same Persons vested with the same Office) then *Priests* or *Bishops* must signify Persons vested with the same Office too, and both those Names are indifferently us'd to signify it. Had they suppos'd *distinct* Offices mention'd in the New Testament, they must have said, there is no mention there made of any *Degrees* or *Distinctions* in Orders, but *Deacons* or *Ministers*, *Priests*, and *Bishops*. And as Mr. B. observ'd before, in describing the Spiritual Power, they shou'd have distinguish'd the *Superior* and more *Extensive* Power of the *Bishops*, from the *Inferior* and *Lesser* Power of the *Priests*, whereas they speak of it as *one* Office indifferently committed to *Priests* and *Bishops*. And therefore by the Way, Mr. Dr—— has no Occasion to make such a Noise about the Mistake of the Transcriber or Printer, in putting in [*Priests or Bishops*] instead of [*Priests and Bishops*] when the Argument no way depends upon it; when the Penners of that Declaration have in the Clause where the Stress of the Argument lies, not only us'd the Phrase *Priests or Bishops*, but us'd it when they undertook to give an Account of all the Distinctions of Orders or Degrees that are mention'd in the New

Testament. And for what Mr. Dr—— adds “ That  
 “ they do hereby no more intimate, that they are the  
 “ same in Power and Authority, than our Church does  
 “ when it saith, the *Priest* or *Bishop* shall pronounce the  
 “ *Absolution*, &c. I can see nothing Parallel in the  
 Two Cases. The Church looks on pronouncing the  
*Absolution* as common both to the *Bishop's* and the  
*Presbyter's* Office, and therefore saith, the *Priest* or  
*Bishop* may pronounce it. But here the *Authors* of  
 this Declaration tell us, they can find no Distinction  
 of Orders but that of *Deacons* or *Ministers*, ( which is  
 but one Order ) and that of *Priests* or *Bishops*, ( which  
 therefore is but One Order more, and not Two as  
 Mr. Dr—— wou'd groundless assert). And yet they  
 may consistently herewith suppose, That the Church  
 had appointed *Ordination* to be appropriated to one in  
 that Order for the sake of Order and Unity. And that  
 they suppose *Bishops* and *Priests* to be only one and the  
 same Order, will be farther evident, when we compare  
 what they here assert, with that Parallel Assertion in  
 the *Erudition of a Christian Man*. Wherein having de-  
 scrib'd the same Spiritual Power (as inclusive of *Preach-*  
*ing*, *Ministering the Sacraments*, *Absolution* and *Excommu-*  
*nication*, ) they positively affirm, “ That of those Two  
 “ Orders only *Priests* and *Deacons* the Scripture makes ex-  
 “ press mention.

To this Mr. Dr—— replies, “ That the Three Orders  
 of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, had been manifestly  
 distinguish'd in that Paper before : And therefore he  
 conjectures, “ That as those who were invested with the  
 “ Episcopal Power, were in the Language of Scripture  
 “ call'd *Apostles*; so the Names of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were  
 “ us'd promiscuously. And so he supposes the Sense to  
 “ be, That the Scripture makes mention only of Two  
 “ Orders, viz. *Priests* and *Deacons*, as made by the *Apo-*  
 “ *stles* or *Bishops*. So that he supposes these two Orders  
 of *Priests* and *Deacons*, to be mentioned in Opposition  
 to the lower Degrees maintain'd by the Church of  
 Rome,

Rome, viz. *Sub-Deacons, Acolytes, &c.* and supposes *Bishops* put in the Place of the *Apostles*.

*Ans.* That this is but a meer Evasion, will appear if we consider these Two Things.

1. That in that *Paper*, as well as in the *Declaration of the Function of Bishops and Priests*, the *Apostles* are every where distinguish'd from *Bishops*, and never confounded with 'em as of the same *Order* and *Office*, as Mr. Dr—— wou'd here pretend. " Thus the *Declaration* asserts the *Spiritual Power* they had describ'd, " to be given by Christ and his *Apostles* to certain Persons only; that is to say, unto *Priests* and *Bishops*, " whom they did elect, &c. And these *Bishops*, at the Close of the *Declaration*, they assert to be of the same *Order* and *Office* with *Priests*, telling us, " There " is no Distinction of Orders in the New Testament " but that of *Deacons* or *Ministers*, *Priests* or *Bishops*. Now according to Mr. Dr——'s Supposition, these *Priests* or *Bishops* must be only meant of an inferior *Order*, as distinguish'd from *Apostles*, and consequently from proper *Bishops* in the modern Sense. But this is apparently false, because *Ordination* and *Excommunication* are reckon'd as a Part of that *Spiritual Power*, committed by the *Apostles* to these *Priests* and *Bishops*, and those are the highest Branches of *Spiritual Power*, that *Bishops* now claim as a superior *Order*, and as the pretended *Successors* of the *Apostles* therein.

Thus in the *Erudition of a Christian Man*, we are told, " That as the *Apostles* in the Beginning of the " Church did order *Priests* and *Bishops*, so they appointed and will'd other *Bishops* after 'em to do the " like.

Now, the *Penners* of that *Paper* did either by *Bishops* intend the same *Order* of Men they call *Priests*; or a distinct *Order*, the same with the *Apostles*. If they intend Persons of the same *Order* with *Priests*, and therefore us'd the Name of *Bishop* and *Priest* promiscuously; then how come they to suppose these *Presbyter-Bishops* vested with the Power of *Excommunication*, and yet suppose at the



same Time the Power of *Excommunication* reserv'd wholly to an *higher Order*, viz. the *Apostles* and their *Successors* in the *Apostolical Office*? This is a plain Contradiction. If on the other Hand, by *Bishops* they there intend an *higher Order* of Men that were properly *Apostles*, and vested with *Apostolical Power*, then the Sense must run thus: "That as the *Apostles* in the "Beginning of the Church did order *Priests* and *Apo-*  
*stles*, so they appointed and willed the other *Apo-*  
*stles* after 'em to do the like. And if this be their Meaning, how come they to mention *Priests* before *Apostles*? And what becomes of the Foundation of Mr. Dr——'s Evasion, That they suppos'd the Name of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* was then common and promiscuous, if *Bishops* signified an *higher Order*, viz. That of *Apostles*? And since they assert the Order of *Deacons* to be made by the *Apostles*, they must suppose the same of the Order of *Priests* and *Bishops*. But if by *Bishops* be meant *Apostles* themselves, how come they to be Makers of their own Order? I had thought they had ow'd their Order to the Immediate Institution of Christ, and not to their own, or to any meer Man's whatsoever? In a Word, Let but the Reader compare these Two Propositions together.

<p>The Truth is, That in the New Testament there is no mention made of any Degrees or Distinction of Orders, but only of <i>Deacons</i> or <i>Ministers</i>, and of <i>Priests</i> or <i>Bishops</i>.</p>	<p>"Of these Two Orders, only <i>Priests</i> and <i>Deacons</i> the Scripture makes express mention.</p>
---	--

And he'll plainly see, they both distinguish *Bishops* from the *Apostles*, and confound 'em with *Priests*, as Persons of the same Office according to the New Testament.

And therefore Mr. Dr—— had better have acquiesc'd in the Judgment of that excellent Historian (the *Bishop of Sarum*) in his ingenuous Confession, "That both in this Declaration and in the Erudition  
 " of

“ of a Christian Man, BISHOPS and PRIESTS are  
 “ spoken of as one Office, than offer'd so lame a De-  
 fence of the contrary Opinion, with little other Evi-  
 dence of it than the Air of Assurance wherewith he  
 delivers it.

And if *Bishops* and *Priests* were according to the  
 New Testament, Men of the *same Order* and *Office*;  
 it must follow of Course, that the present Authority  
 of *Bishops* over *Priests* or *Presbyters*, is only of *Human*  
*Institution*.

And for Mr. Dr——'s Objection, “ That if the  
 “ Stream of our First Reformers had run for *Presbytery*,  
 “ how come they to establish *Episcopacy*? ” Twill ap-  
 pear to be of no Force to any that considers, That tho'  
 they did not believe the present *Episcopacy* to be of  
*Divine Right*, yet they might think it a *laudable Hu-*  
*mane Constitution*, of *long continuance in the Church*, and  
*therefore fit to be retain'd*.

But Mr. Dr—— tells Mr. B. “ That tho' Dr. Bur-  
 “ net's Concession shou'd be allow'd, yet their *Decla-*  
 “ *ration* will do him no Service, because those very  
 “ Men who were the Compilers of this Book, viz.  
 “ *the Erudition of a Christian Man*, were of a quite  
 “ different Opinion soon after, viz. the First Year of  
 “ King Edward's Reign, when in the *Preface* to the  
 “ *Book of Ordination*, they lay down this Position,  
 “ *That 'tis evident to all Men diligently reading Holy*  
 “ *Scriptures and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles*  
 “ *Time there have been these Orders of Ministers in*  
 “ *Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*. But I  
 have already shewn him from their own Writers, that  
 this Assertion it self, does not necessarily suppose  
*Bishops* as an Order distinct from *Presbyters* to be of  
*Divine Right*. It only supposes such a *Superiority* of  
*Bishops*, to have sprung up in the Church soon after  
 the Apostle's Days, and to have had some Countenance  
 given to it by *Apostolical Practice*, as recorded in the  
 New Testament. But the greatest Divines of the  
 Establish'd Church, do not suppose a bare *Apostolical*  
*Practice*

*Practice*, to be a sufficient Proof of a *Divine Right*. And I may add, That that *Primitive Episcopacy*, was (as I shall shew afterwards) quite a distinct Thing from *Diocesan Episcopacy*, and absolutely inconsistent with it.

For *Archbishop Cranmer*, as his Opinion is full and clear, "That Bishop and Priest, were all one in the Beginning of Christ's Religion; so Mr. Dr——'s Arguments to prove that he retracted it are of no Force. The Passage he cites in his *Sermon*, p. 26. does no way contradict it, since it no way asserts *Priests* and *Bishops* to be at the Beginning Two distinct Orders. His Subscription to Dr. *Leighton's* Opinion, depends on Mr. *Durell's* Testimony, (an *Author* as I shall shew afterwards of no manner of Credit.) And Dr. *Leighton's* Opinion it self, does not assert *Priest* and *Bishop* to be Two distinct Orders. And for the *Clause* in the *Preface* to the *Book of Ordination*, I have already shewn, it does not assert the *Divine Right* of *Bishops* as a distinct Order from *Priests*.

Mr. B. had said, "That he cannot imagine, Why  
 " that Declaration of the *Episcopal Jurisdiction's* being of  
 " *Divine Right*, cou'd have been a more fatal Blow to  
 " the *Papacy* at the *Council of Trent*, than the Declara-  
 " tion of *Bishops* and *Presbyter's* being the same Office  
 " according to the *Scriptures* wou'd have been. For as  
 " he there shew'd, the Declaration of the latter (had it  
 " been practicable in such a Council of *Bishops*) wou'd  
 " have struck more deeply at the Root of all the  
 " *Papal* Pretensions, and more clearly shewn the  
 " monstrous Absurdity and Arrogance of any one  
 " Man's claiming an universal Government over the  
 " *Catholick Church*, who cou'd by *Divine Right* claim  
 " no more than the Government of a particular One.  
 " Whereas, the *Episcopal Government* of an *Imperial*  
 " City, (in the modern Sense) was at least a much  
 " larger Step towards the Government of the *Univer-*  
 " *sal Church*, or at least of the Church within the  
 " Bounds of the *Roman Empire*.



In Answer to this, Mr. Dr—— tells him, “ That  
 “ Father Paul’s History shews, how the *Italian Bishops*  
 “ labour’d against the Determination of the Divine  
 “ Right of Episcopacy. And that in the Decretals  
 “ collected by P. Gregory the IXth, this is One, *Sacros*  
 “ *Ordines dicimus Diaconatum & Episcopatum, hos sci-*  
 “ *licet solos primitiva Ecclesia legitur habuisse.* I con-  
 fess I understand not by what Grammar, Mr. Dr——  
 comes to translate this Passage thus, *We call Deacon-*  
*ship and Presbytership Sacred Orders, for those only the*  
*Primitive Church is read to have had.* How comes  
*Episcopacy* to signify *Presbytership*? But to pass that  
 Mistake, does Mr. Dr—— think, that Gregory the IXth,  
 or that any other Pope of later Days believes, that the  
 Scripture asserts no other Order than that of *Presbyters*  
 and *Deacons*? What, do they not think St. Peter to  
 be of an higher Order, and themselves as his *Successors*  
 to be so? If not, how comes he to tell us, “ We see  
 “ here the Pope and the *Presbyterians* conspiring a-  
 “ gainst the Sacred Order of *Episcopacy* as distinguish’d  
 “ from *Presbytery*. One wou’d rather conclude, by the  
 Passage, that the Authors of it suppos’d only the Of-  
 fice of *Bishops* and *Deacons* to be of *Divine Right*, and  
 that the Office of *Presbyters* is wholly of Humane In-  
 stitution. And this Mr. Dr—— knows is actually  
 Dr. Hammond’s Scheme; so that I might better say,  
 we see here the Pope and the Patrons of *Episcopacy*, con-  
 spiring against the Sacred Order of *Presbyters*. But  
 the Truth is, That the *Divine Right* of only *Two standing*  
*Orders* and *Offices*, to be continu’d in the Church accord-  
 ing to the Scriptures, shone with so bright a Light,  
 and was so fully attested by St. Jerome, that it cou’d  
 not be wholly obscur’d by the Darkness of *Popery* it self.

But Mr. Dr—— to support his Pretensions tells us,  
 from Father Paul, “ That the *Italians* strove against  
 “ the Declaration of the Divine Right of Episcopacy  
 “ in the Council of Trent: From Bishop Sanderson,  
 “ That the Voting down of Episcopacy in England,  
 “ occasion’d great Joy and Triumph among those of  
 “ the

“ the *Romish* Party; And from Dr. *Stillingfleet*, “ That  
 “ Cardinal *Barbarino* said, He cou’d be contented, there  
 “ were no Priests in England, so there were no Bishops;

*Ans.* I wou’d desire Mr. Dr. — to review all this, and  
 tell me, what it signifies to the main Argument. I grant  
 him, That the asserting of the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan*  
*Episcopacy*, wou’d not Favour the Papal Pretension of  
 being by Divine Right the sole *Universal Bishop*. And  
 so wou’d the Declaration of all Pastors of the Church,  
 being by Divine Right equal, much more overturn his  
 Pretensions. And had the Council been of that Opi-  
 nion, he wou’d have found the *Bishop of Rome* as  
 warm and violent in opposing it, and rather much  
 more, because it wou’d level his Authority with that  
 of every *Parish-Pastor* or *Bishop*, and not so much as  
 leave him any Claim by Divine Right, to a sole Ju-  
 risdiction over the Clergy within the Bounds of that  
 City, and much less the *Ecclesiastical State* it self, and  
 least of all to an *Universal Monarchy*.

But Mr. Dr. — saith, “ If the Papists cou’d once  
 “ bring it about, that the Parity of Bishops and Pres-  
 “ byters, shou’d once be the current Doctrine of our  
 “ Church, they wou’d not despair of making our Peo-  
 “ ple out of Love with the Reformed Religion; when  
 “ they cou’d shew, that the main Pillar of it had  
 “ neither Scripture nor Antiquity to support it.

*Ans.* This Parity is (as I shall shew) the com-  
 mon Doctrine of both *Lutheran* and *Calvinist* Churches.  
 And yet I find not, that it makes their People at all  
 out of Love with the *Reformed Religion*. For making  
 it a Pillar of their Religion, (i. e. an Essential Article  
 of it) I know no Protestant Churches so void of Judg-  
 ment and Charity, as to reckon the particular Form of  
 Church-Government Essential to the Christian Church,  
 (as some of our late *High-Flyers* have done in Con-  
 junction with the *Popish Writers*) : But if they only as-  
 sert the Truth of that Doctrine, they will not want  
 sufficient Evidence from Scripture to support it; and e-  
 ven from *Antiquity* it self, to overthrow all Pretension

to the *Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy*. And I do not see but that those *Reformed Churches* stand as firm against *Popery*, as any others that are expos'd to the same Opposition from the *Romish Church*.

But saith Mr. Dr—— “ The Papists might entertain some hopes, That a little Dominion over their Fellow-Presbyters, and large Revenues may reconcile 'em to his Holiness, since he pretends to the Disposal of such Preferments: Whereas, if it be declared, That all Bishops are on a level, and that the Pope by Gods Law has no more Power than any other Bishop, there can be no Temptation to declare for the Papacy.

*Ans.* This Argument indeed may weigh much; but then 'tis only with Men of Ambitious and Worldly Minds. *Dominion* and *Wealth* are no doubt to such Men very powerful Motives in the Choice of their Party in Religion. But for such *Protestant* Clergymen, as wou'd upon such Considerations as these be reconcil'd to his Holiness, and to all the Errors, Idolatries, and Superstitions in the *Romish Religion*, they are no way fit to bear any Office in any *Reformed Church* at all; and their Defection to the *Church of Rome* wou'd be no great Loss. And therefore, all that can be made of Cardinal Barbarino's Saying, is, That he judg'd like a Man well skill'd in Worldly Policy, that so many of the *English Clergy* were so fond of their great Revenues and Dignities, that they wou'd rather embrace the *Romish Religion* than part with them. But whether this Insinuation be for the Honour of the *English Clergy*, I must leave Mr. Dr—— at his Leisure to consider? But I must remind him, That the Bishops of *England* might pursuant to *Archbishop Usher's Model* have retain'd both, and yet made such Concessions, as wou'd have heal'd the unhappy Breaches there.

For *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign, 'tis strange, That Mr. Dr—— Shou'd alledge *Archbishop Whitgift* as a Patron of the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, when Mr. B. had shew'd him from Dr. *Stillingfleets Irenicum*, “ That

“ be



“ he thought no particular Form of Church Government  
 “ of Divine Right. And it is yet stranger, That he  
 shou’d produce *Bishop Morton’s* Authority for that  
 Opinion, and never once consider the plain Testimony  
 produc’d out of his *Cathol. Apol.* to the contrary,  
 wherein he tells the Papists, “ That the Power of  
 “ Order and Jurisdiction which they ascribed to Bishops,  
 “ doth *de Jure Divino* belong to all other Presbyters,  
 “ and particularly, That to Ordain is their ancient  
 “ Right.

That *Bishop Juell* did suppose, there was by *Ecclesiastical Custom*, a Distinction between Bishops and Priests, I freely grant him : But that he founded it on Divine Right, is manifestly false from the large Passage *Mr. B.* cited out of him, wherein he does not merely censure *Harding* for condemning the Doctrine of the Parity of Bishops and Presbyters as Heretical, but plainly supposes that Opinion, to be both agreeable to Scripture, and to the Doctrine of *St. Jerome*, *St. Austin*, and *St. Ambrose*; and in the former Passage he cites with Approbation these known and remarkable Words of *St. Jerome*, “ Let Bishops know, That they are in Authority over Priests more by Custom than by Order of God’s Truth. And if such poor Evasions as these be sufficient to invalidate such clear Testimonies, ’tis in vain to debate any such Matters of Fact.

For *Dr. Willet*, The Passages cited of him are so plain, and carry so bright and clear Evidence with them that *Mr. Dr. —* himself durst not attempt to look ’em in the Face : He therefore endeavours to confront ’em with some other Passages of *Dr. Willet’s*, that he thinks more favourable to his Opinion. But ’tis evident to any that consider ’em, That if *Dr. Willet* be consistent with himself, there may be Order in the Church, and Diversity of Degrees and Ministrations, without making Bishop and Presbyter to be by Divine Right of Two distinct Orders. Those that plead for their being the same Order, deny not the Superiority the Apostles had over the Scriptural Bishops or Presbyters: Nay they

they do not oppose any such *Superiority of Degree* as belongs to *Moderators*, and is necessary for the *Preservation of Order* in all associated Bodies of *Ministers*; and this is all that *Dr. Willet* can be prov'd to assert there as of *Divine Right*. And *Mr. B.* had there shewn him, that *Dr. Willet* ascribes the *Bishops Powers of Confirmation, Ordination, Jurisdiction, giving License to Presbyters to preach*, to belong only to *Ecclesiastical Policy*, as that is distinguish'd from *Apostolical Institution*; and these are the very *Powers* that we dispute about the *Divine Right* of.

For *Dr. Bancroft*, I confess *Mr. Dr.* has some Ground to cite him, as maintaining his Opinion of the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*: But I am surpriz'd that he shou'd produc'd *Dr. Reynolds* as concurring with him therein, when he will find that learned Defender of the *Prot. Cause* so fully declaring his Sentiments to the contrary, in the *Remarks* he makes on a *Sermon* of *Dr. Bancroft's*: And because his *Letter* on that Occasion to *Sir Francis Knolls*, does fully contain not only his own particular Sentiments in that Point, but what he took to be then the common Doctrine of the *English* and other *Protestant Churches*; I shall recite it at large.

“ Altho’ (most *Honoured*.) I please my self more in  
 “ the Pains I take in opening and overthrowing the  
 “ Errors of *Jesuits* and *Papists*, (the Adversaries of  
 “ Truth,) than those of the *Ministers of Christ*; yet  
 “ because your *Honour* was pleas’d to require of me,  
 “ that I shou’d lay before you my Judgment concern-  
 “ ing some Things, which some of the last Sort de-  
 “ fend and maintain, I thought it my Duty (follow-  
 “ ing the Example of *Levi*, Deut. ch. 33. who said to  
 “ his Father and Mother, and to his Brethren, I know  
 “ you not) to lay open the Truth without any respect  
 “ of Persons.

“ Of the Two Opinions which your *Honour* men-  
 “ tions in the *Sermon* of *Dr. Bancroft's*: The First is,  
 “ That which asserts the *Superiority*, which the *Prelates*  
 among

among us have over the Clergy, to be a Divine Institution. He does not indeed assert this in express Words, but he does it by necessary Consequence, in that he affirms the Opinion of those that oppose that Superiority to be an *Heresy*; in which in my Judgment, he has committed an Oversight, and I believe he himself will acknowledge it, if duly admonish'd concerning it. For after he had said First, That it was the Opinion of *Aerius*, That a Priest and Bishop did not differ according to the Word of God, and that *Martin* and his Followers defended this Opinion of *Aerius*; He adds, That *Aerius* persisting in this Opinion, was condemn'd as an Heretick by the general Consent of the whole Church, and that the Opinion of *Martin* and his Followers was condemned as an *Heresy*. As for *Martin*, if any one behave himself contrary to the Rules of Prudence and Charity, let the Nocent be found Guilty: Undertake not his Cause: But if he intermix therewith something of Divine Truth, there is no Reason that what is Divine, shou'd be condemn'd for the mixture of Humane Infirmary; no more than that we shou'd condemn the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, because the *Pharisees* maintain'd it. Wherefore, separating the odious Name of *Martin*, from what is now to be treated of in a sincere and friendly Manner, it appears from the before-cited Words of Dr. *Bancroft*, that he takes that Prebeminence which the Bishops have above the Clergy, to be a Divine Institution. For they that oppose that Superiority, are reprov'd for judging with *Aerius*, that there is no Difference according to the Word of God between a Bishop and a Priest. But this Charge he (i. e. Dr. *Bancroft*) cou'd not reasonably bring, unless he suppos'd that Superiority of Bishops to be establish'd by the Word of God. And he adds, that the Opinion of those that dissent from him herein is *Heretical*; Whence it follows, That he takes it to be contrary to the Word of God, since *Heresy* is an Error repugnant



"nant to the Word of God, as the Church teaches us  
 "according to the Holy Scriptures: But the Argu-  
 "ments he brings to prove that Opinion *Heretical*,  
 "are partly *weak* and partly *false*. That Argument  
 "drawn from *Epiphanius* with which he begins, is  
 "weak. That which he adds concerning the *Consent*  
 "of the *Universal Church*, is *false*. For tho' *Epipha-*  
 "nius charges the Assertion of *Aerius* with Folly, yet  
 "he no way refutes that Argument from the Holy  
 "Scriptures that *Aerius* relied on: Nay, when he goes  
 "about to refute it, he manages it so, that *Bellarmino*  
 "tho' (*Tom. 1. Contr. 5. l. 1. c. 15.*) he defends his  
 "Opinion against the *Protestants*, is yet forc'd to  
 "confess, That *Epiphanius's* Answer is no way discreet  
 "nor agreeable to the Text. As to the *general Consent*  
 "of the Church; by which Dr. *Bancroft* saith, that  
 "*Aerius's* Opinion was condemn'd as *Heretical*, and  
 "himself as an *Heretick* for persisting in it, 'tis very  
 "largely spoken. But how will he prove this to  
 "have been done by the Church? He saith it ap-  
 "pears from *Epiphanius*. But it does not appear;  
 "Nay, the contrary appears from *Jerome* on the *Epi-*  
 "istle of *Titus*, and in his *Epistle to Euagrius*, and from  
 "some others that were *Epiphanius's* Contemporaries,  
 "or flourish'd after him. Even from *Austin* him-  
 "self, tho' Dr. *Bancroft* cites him as a Witness with  
 "*Epiphanius* concerning the *Universal Consent* of the  
 "Church. I confess St. *Austin* in his *Book of Hereses*,  
 "does charge *Aerius* with *Heresy* for saying, *There*  
 "ought to be no Difference between them (which when  
 "*Aerius* affirm'd he condemn'd the Order of the  
 "Church, and was *Author* of a *Schism*) on which Ac-  
 "count he is censur'd by *Austin*, who in reckoning up  
 "*Hereses* follows *Epiphanius*, when he himself does  
 "not deny (in his *Preface de Heresibus ad quod vult*  
 "*Deum*) that he knew not how far the Name of *Heresy*  
 "did extend. But 'tis another Thing to say, That  
 "there is no Difference between them according to the  
 "Word, but only according to the Custom of the Church.  
 "The

“ The latter, *Austin* himself does in Effect assert *Ep. 19.*  
 “ so far is he from testifying that this Opinion was  
 “ chargeable with *Heresy*, by the general Consent of  
 “ the whole Church: But how groundlessly this erro-  
 “ neous Opinion is ascrib’d to *Austin* and *Epiphanius*,  
 “ ( the only Witnesses whom *Dr. Bancroft* has pro-  
 “ duc’d, or as far as I know can produce ) will hence  
 “ appear, that our Countryman ( *M. P.* ) of pious Me-  
 “ mory *Bishop Juell*, *Def. Apol. p. 2. c. 9. lib. 1.* after  
 “ that *Harding*, citing the same Witnesses, had brand-  
 “ ed that Opinion as *Heresy*; and he ( i. e. *Bishop*  
 “ *Juell* ) had cited *Chrysostome*, *Jerome*, *Austin*, *Am-*  
 “ *brose* to the contrary, he concludes his Answer in  
 “ these Words, *All these and other Holy Fathers with*  
 “ *the Apostle Paul, if Harding may be Judge, will pass*  
 “ *for Hereticks.*  
 “ *Michael Medina*, a Man of chief Note in the  
 “ Council of *Trent*, being more ingenuous in this  
 “ Cause than other Papists, affirms not only the fore-  
 “ mention’d Authors whom *Bishop Juell* cites, but also  
 “ *Theodoret*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius* and *Theophylact*. to have  
 “ been of the same Opinion with *Aerius*. Moreover  
 “ *Oecumenius* in *Tim. 3.* and *Anselm Archbishop of Can-*  
 “ *terbury* in *Ep. ad Titum*. Another *Anselm Collect. Can.*  
 “ *lib. 7. c. 87 & 127.* and *Gregory Polit. l. 2. Tit. 19.*  
 “ *39.* and *Gratian Ca. Legimus Dist. 39.* and *Ca. olim*  
 “ *Dist. 95.* and after them many others. This Opi-  
 “ nion was once in the Body of the Canon-Law, and  
 “ was accounted *Sound* and *Catholic* Doctrine, and  
 “ which accordingly learned Men publicly taught.  
 “ All which attest contrary to *Dr. Bancroft*, that this  
 “ Opinion was not condemn’d as *Heretical* by the  
 “ Consent of the whole Church. For if he reply,  
 “ that these later Witnesses liv’d a 1000 Years after  
 “ Christ, and therefore reach not him who asserted,  
 “ That it was reckon’d an *Heresy* in the Times of  
 “ *Austin* and *Epiphanius*, when the Church flourish’d  
 “ most in Learning and Zeal (if we except the Apo-  
 “ stolical Age). ’Tis answer’d, That tho’ those I have  
 last

" last nam'd liv'd in later Times, yet they testify  
 " concerning former Ages. *Oecumenius* the Scholiast  
 " follows the Steps of the most ancient *Greek* Fathers.  
 " Both the *Anselms*, together with *Gregory* and *Gratian*,  
 " express *Verbatim* the Judgment of *Jerome*. And  
 " 'tis not very likely, That *Anselm* Archbishop of  
 " *Canterbury* should be canoniz'd by the *Roman* Pope,  
 " and be made a *Saint*, and that the other *An-*  
 " *selm* and *Gratian* shou'd find a Place in the Libraries  
 " of the *Papists*, and be held in such Veneration as  
 " we now see 'em; and that *Gratian's* Works shou'd  
 " for so many Ages be esteem'd by the Popes, as the  
 " *Golden Foundation* of their *Canon-Law*, if they had  
 " taught any Thing for *Catholick* and *Sound*, which  
 " had been in the most flourishing Times since the  
 " Apostles Days, condemned by the general Consent  
 " of the whole Church. Especially when the Thing  
 " is of so great Moment and Weight to establish that  
 " *Supremacy*, which the Popes claim over all Bishops  
 " by *Divine Right*; and therefore must acknowledge,  
 " That the same Superiority is due to Bishops over  
 " *Presbyters* by the same Right. And they saw this at  
 " last; which was the Reason, why this Opinion was  
 " decreed in the Council of *Trent*, and this Note inserted  
 " in the New Body of the *Canon-Law*, [ *There has*  
 " *been always a Difference, and still is between Bishops*  
 " *and Presbyters, in respect of Government, Prehemi-*  
 " *nence, Sacraments, But the Name and Title is common*  
 " *to both.* ] And this they wou'd have to be hereafter  
 " reckon'd the Judgment of *Jerome*, at least this is  
 " the Sense of the *Canon* taken out of *Jerome*. Tho'  
 " the Words of *Jerome* (as *Bellarmino* confesses in the  
 " Place fore-cited) overturn this Gloss.  
 " To which it may be added, That all they who  
 " have for 500 Years last past, endeavour'd the Re-  
 " formation of the Church have taught, That all  
 " Pastors, whether they be call'd Bishops or Priests, are  
 " invested with equal Authority and Power. First, The  
 " *Waldenses* in *Æn. Sylv. Hist. Bob. c. 39.* And *Pigh.*



" *Hierarch. Eccles.* l. 2. c. 10. Next *Marfil. Patav.* in *De-*  
 " *fens Pacis* 2 Part, c. 15. Then *Wickliff* in *Thom. Wald.*  
 " *Doctr. fidei.* Tom. 1. L. 2. c. 5. and Tom. 2. c. 7.  
 " And his Disciples afterwards, *Husse* and the *Hufites*,  
 " *Æn. Sylv.* in the Place above-cited. Lastly, *Luther*  
 " *Adversus falsò nominatos Episcopos & adversus Papa-*  
 " *tum Romanum.* *Calv.* in *Ep. ad Phil.* 1. and *Tit.* 1.  
 " *Brentius Apol. Confess. Wittemb.* c. 2. *Bullinger Decad.* 5.  
 " *Serm.* 3. *Musculus Loc. Com. Tit. de Ministerio Verbi,*  
 " and others who might be particularly nam'd in great  
 " Number. Since not only our Bishops, as *Juell* in  
 " the Place fore-cited: but *Pilkington* in his *Treatise of*  
 " *the Burning of Paul's Church*, the *Regius Professors* of  
 " *Divinity*, *Humfrey*, and *Whitaker* against *Campion*  
 " and *Duraus*, with other learned Men, *Bradford*,  
 " *Lambert*, *Fulk* do agree in this Matter? And so do  
 " all Divines beyond Sea that I ever read, and doubt-  
 " less many more whom I never read. Two only  
 " have (as far as I can learn) undertaken to examine  
 " the *Decrees* of the *Council of Trent*, one a *Divine*,  
 " the other a *Lawyer*, *Chemnitius* and *Gentiletus*. Both  
 " condemn the contrary Doctrine [viz. that of the *Divine*  
 " *Right of Episcopacy*] and reckon it among the other  
 " *Errors* of the *Council of Trent*. The one relying  
 " on the *Scriptures*, and the *Fathers*, the other on the  
 " *Canon-Law*. But what need I make any further  
 " mention of particular Writers, This is the common  
 " Doctrine of the Churches of *Helvetia*, *Switzerland*, *France*,  
 " *Scotland*, *Germany*, *Hungary*, *Poland*, *Belgium*, and  
 " lastly, of *England*, as the *Harmony of Confessions*  
 " witnesseth, *Sect.* 2. Wherefore, since *Dr. Bancroft*  
 " will certainly never pretend, that an *Heresy* con-  
 " demn'd by the Consent of the whole Church in its  
 " most flourishing Times was yet accounted a *Sound*  
 " and *Christian Doctrine* by all these I have mention'd,  
 " I hope he will confess himself mistaken when he  
 " asserted, That the *Authority of Bishops over the Clergy*  
 " was founded on *Divine Institution*. And so much for  
 " the First Tenet of his Sermon.

He then proceeds to the Second *Tenet* of Dr. Bancroft's Sermon, viz. " That *Jerome* and *Calvin* date this Superiority of Bishops from the Time of *Mark* the *Evangelist*. This Opinion he also at large confutes. But because it does not so directly concern the present Debate, I shall not trouble the Reader with reciting it at large; But only observe, that commenting on those Words of St. *Jerome*, wherein he saith, *What does a Bishop perform that a Presbyter cannot do, except Ordination?* he tells us, " That *Jerome* having prov'd that the Bishops and Priests in the Apostle's Time were one and the same Order, he grants, that afterwards, Bishops assum'd to themselves the sole Power of Ordination in some Places; and that was the only Power they appropriated to themselves.

And here Mr. Dr. = may see, That that Learned Defender of the *Prot.* Cause, not only censures this Opinion of the *Divine Right of Episcopacy* as a *Novel Opinion*, contrary to the *Doctrine* of the *Scriptures* and the *Fathers*, but contrary to that of all the *Reformed Churches*, that of *England* not excepted, and contrary to the Judgment of the most celebrated Writers the *English Church* then had. In a Word, he makes the contrary Opinion of the *Scriptural Bishop and Priest being the same*, the common *Doctrine* of all that for 500 Years past, had made any Attempts towards a *Reformation*. Nay, he ranks the contrary *Doctrine* among the *Errors* of the Council of *Trent*, by which they had chang'd the formerly current *Doctrine* of their own Church, and he supposes it very favourable to the *Pretensions* of the *Papal Supremacy*.

See also *Bishop Bedell's* Sentiments very conformable to these of Dr. *Reignolds* in his *Life* wrote by the *Bishop of Sarum*, p. 453, and 464, 465. And I may add, That Dr. *Bancroft* himself allow'd the Validity of Ordination by *Presbyters*; for when a Commission was issued under the Great Seal of *England* to the Bishops of *London, Ely, Wells, and Rochester*, to consecrate Mr. *J. Spotswood*, Mr. *Gawen Hamilton*, and Mr. *Andrew Lamb*, Bishops,

*Bishop Andrews* objected, That they cou'd not be consecrated *Bishops*, because they had never been made *Presbyters*, but by *Presbyters*: *Bishop Bancroft* reply'd, there was no *Necessity* thereof, the Ordination of *Presbyters* by *Presbyters* being valid, where *Bishops* could not be had.

Let the World then Judge, what Pretence *Mr. Dr —* has to say, “ That *Mr. B.* argues from the private Sentiments of Three or Four Persons to the Publick Judgment of a National Church, and that this is as absurd, as if he shou'd conclude all the *Presbyterians* of *Dublin* are *Socinians*, because one of the most noted of 'em was so. He very well knows, That one *Socinian* never pretended his Doctrine to be the common Doctrine of the *Presbyterian* Churches; That it was universally disown'd, and himself discarded for it. And will *Mr. Dr —* pretend any Parallel hereto in the Case of the *Authors* I have mention'd, who were among the most celebrated *Writers* of the *National Church*, and whose *Writings* were not only never disown'd, but on the contrary were entertain'd with general Esteem and Applause in the Age wherein they liv'd?

For *Archbishop Usher's* Judgment, tho' he might think Ordination by *Presbyters*, where there were *Bishops*, irregular; 'tis evident he did not think it null and void, (as *Mr. Dr —* does). Nor does it appear that he thought it irregular, where *Bishops* impos'd such Terms of Ordination as appear'd Sinful in the Judgment of such *Presbyters*. And since this is the Case with Reference to the *Dissenters*, *Mr. Dr —* has no ground to assert, That they were *Schismaticks* in this *Bishop's* Opinion.

But that the *Archbishop* did neither think *Bishops* a distinct Order from *Presbyters*, nor that Ordination was by *Divine Right* appropriated to that Order, appears from his own Words produc'd by *Dr. Parr* who wrote his Life. “ The intrinsical Power of Ordaining proceeds not from *Jurisdiction*, but only from Order. “ But a *Presbyter* hath the same Order in Specie with a *Bishop*



“ *Bishop*. Ergo, A *Presbyter* hath equally an intrinſical  
 “ Power to give *Orders*, and is equal to him in the  
 “ Power of *Orders*. The *Bishop* having no higher De-  
 “ gree in reſpect of the *Intenſion* or *Extension* of the  
 “ Character of *Order*, tho’ he has an higher Degree  
 “ (i. e. a more eminent Place) in reſpect of *Authority*  
 “ and *Juriſdiction* in Spiritual Regiment. See *Ap-  
 “ pendix to his Life*, p. 6.

And for what Mr. Dr. — adds, “ That all the  
 “ Reformed Churches Abroad, condemn thoſe whom he  
 “ calls *Separatiſts* as inexcusable *Schiſmaticks*, he has pro-  
 duced no tolerable Proof of it. There is no ſuch Thing  
 aſſerted in the *Letter* of the *Doctōrs of Geneva* to thoſe  
 of *Oxford*. That all the Reformed Churches have done  
 it, is a groſs Untruth; for which he produces no  
 Voucher but Mr. *Durell*, an *Author* too notorious for  
 his many Falſhoods and Miſtakes of that Kind to de-  
 ſerve any Credit. His Quotation from *Calvin* does no  
 way concern ſuch *Biſhops* as our’s, as the *Author* of  
*Strictura breves*, and ſeveral others have obſerv’d. Nor  
 have the *Dissenters* declar’d their Judgment againſt the  
*Lawfulneſs* of all *Episcopacy*, ſince they offer’d to ſub-  
 mit to *Archbiſhop Uſher’s Model* of it. So that all the  
 Paſſages Mr. Dr. — has cited, are either untrue or  
 nothing to the *Purpose* of the preſent Debate. I am  
 ſure, they none of ’em aſſert the *Divine Right* of  
*Episcopacy*.

And ’tis as untrue, That any conſiderable Number  
 of the foreign Reformed Churches have aſſerted the  
*Neceſſity of Dioceſan Episcopacy*. *Melanchton’s* Deſire of  
 the *Reſtoration* of it, did not eſcape the Censure of his  
 Brethren, tho’ he ſaith nothing of the *Neceſſity* of it.  
 The *N. C. Divines* expreſs’d as much readineſs to ſub-  
 mit to a moderate *Episcopacy*, as the *Prince of Hai-  
 nault’s* Words amount to. And Mr. Dr. — is at a ſad  
 Loſs for Arguments when *Bogerman’s* Civil Complement  
 to the *Biſhop of Landaff* at the *Synod of Dort*, *Non ſu-  
 mus adeo felices*, paſſes for one. But if Mr. Dr. —  
 wou’d offer any Thing to the *Purpose*, let him pro-

duce any celebrated Writer of the Reformed Churches Abroad, or any Number of 'em that ever asserted the *Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy*; and then his *Authorities* shall be consider'd. But that the Reformed Churches have inserted the contrary Opinion even in their *Publick Confessions*, has been already observ'd by Dr. *Reignolds*, and I shall have Occasion in the Sequel to give M. Dr—— such clear Evidence of it, as is sufficient to *put an End* to this Part of the Dispute.

## REMARKS on CHAP. II.

**M**R. Dr—— proposing in this Chapter to prove, That *Episcopacy* was believ'd to be of *Divine Right* by the *First Fathers* of the Church, premises *Two Observations*.

*First*, “ He charges Mr. B. with this as one of his “ *Mistakes*, that he had ignorantly or wilfully run in- “ to, and obstinately persists in; viz. *Of confining the “ Office of every particular Minister of the Gospel to a “ particular Congregation*. In Opposition whereto, he tells us, “ That the Office of every *Bishop*, yea of eve- “ ry *Presbyter*, reaches to the whole Church of Christ, “ and the *Limitation* of their Power to a particular “ District, is wholly owing to *Compact* and *Agreement* “ for the avoiding the Disorder that might otherwise “ happen, &c.

On this *Observation* of Mr. Dr——’s, I have the following *Remarks* to make.

I. That ’tis utterly untrue, That Mr. B. had confin’d the Office of every particular Minister of the Gospel to a particular Congregation.

Mr. B. had told him, “ That his Assertion, viz. “ That *Bishops* are *Bishops* of the whole Church, may “ admit of a double Sense; viz. either that his Office “ does empower him to teach and rule in any Part of “ the Christian Church (*occasionally* or *statedly*) where he

“ he is regularly called thereto: Or that every *Bishop*  
 “ has as truly the *whole Church* for his *Province* and  
 “ *Charge* as the *Apostles* had, and their Authority is  
 “ wherever they come as *Extensive* and *Unlimited* as  
 “ that of the *Apostles* was. If *Mr. Dr* — means the  
 “ former, what he saith is nothing to his Purpose, &c.

Now 'tis at first View obvious, That the *former* of  
 these Assertions which *Mr. B.* there declares his Assent  
 to, is directly contrary to what *Mr. Dr* — charges him  
 with, and demonstrates his Charge to be absolutely  
 groundless. And he himself cites these very Words of  
*Mr. B.* and professes his want of Capacity to under-  
 stand 'em. For his *Understanding*, 'tis not in my Power  
 to help it: But I am sure if every Ministers Office  
 empower him to teach and rule (*occasionally or statedly*)  
 in any Part of the Christian Church wherever he is regu-  
 larly call'd, it cannot be confin'd to *One Congregation*;  
 for then he cou'd not by Virtue of his Office, teach or  
 perform any other Act belonging to his Ministerial  
 Office in another Congregation. Nay shou'd he be on  
 any just Occasion remov'd from one Church to another,  
 his Office wou'd be dissolv'd when his Relation to the  
 former Congregation ceas'd, and he would need a new  
*Ordination* to enable him to undertake a new Charge;  
 all which is as remote from *Mr. B.*'s Sentiments, as it  
 can be from his. And therefore he need not send  
*Mr. B.* to *Mr. Pool's Quo Warranto* for better Instru-  
 ction, *Mr. Pool's* Judgment in that Matter being  
 the same with *Mr. B.*'s. And to talk of a Man's  
 preaching as a *Gifted Brother* when he preaches by  
 Virtue of his Office, is a Piece of contradictory  
*Non-Sense* that *Mr. B.* must desire *Mr. Dr* — to keep  
 to himself; for *Mr. B.*'s Words are utterly inconsistent  
 with that Senseless Construction he wou'd put upon 'em.

But to set this Matter in a clearer Light than  
*Mr. Dr* — has done; I shall offer what follows to the  
 Reader's Consideration.



The Office of every particular Minister of the Gospel may be consider'd as it respects the *Infidel World*, the *Universal Church*, or a *particular Church*.

As his Office respects the *Infidel World*, so it impowers him as he has Opportunity to endeavour the Conversion of Infidels by instructing 'em in the Christian Faith, and by Baptism to admit such Converts into the Catholick Visible Church.

As his Office respects the *Universal Church*, so it impowers him to perform such Ministerial Acts as *Teaching*, *Administring the Sacraments*, &c. either *Occasionally* wherever he is regularly call'd to give *temporary Assistance* to any other settled Pastors in their Work, or *statedly*, where he is himself call'd to undertake the *fixed Charge* of a *particular Church*, either *alone* or in *conjunction with others* as his *Colleagues*. And it impowers him to act in his Sphere, for the general Edification and Good of the *whole Church*. And this is all that Mr. Dr——'s Citations from *Origen*, *Chrysostome*, and *Eleutherius* can amount to.

If he is call'd to take the *Pastoral Care* of any *particular Church*, that *Relation* does confine the *Ordinary Exercise* of his Ministry to that Church, tho' it does not bar him from performing any *Ministerial Acts* to other Churches where his *occasional Assistance* is desired. But the *particular Church* whose *Pastor* he has undertaken to be, may justly claim the chief Interest in his *stated Labours* and Care while that Relation continues. And 'tis in this Sense, that Mr. B. affirms with St. *Chrysostome*, " That a *Bishop's Charge* is ordinarily affix'd to one Place; and with St. *Cyprian*, " That only a Part or Portion of the *Universal Church*, " is committed to every particular Bishop as his ordinary Charge and Care. And if Mr. Dr—— grants this (as he tells us he does p. 35) he grants all Mr. B. pleads for, and what I shall now shew makes against himself.

For the Office of an *Apostle* cou'd not be ordinarily so confin'd to any *particular Church*. They had not acted

acted pursuant to their Instructions if they had made any *particular Church* or *Churches* their *Ordinary Charge* and *Care*. For their principal Work was to preach the Gospel to the Infidel World, and to settle particular Churches wherever they had gain'd a sufficient Number of Converts, and to constitute such *Elders* or *Bishops*, as shou'd become their ordinary *Teachers* and *Rulers*, and then to labour for the Conversion of Infidels in other Parts. And they had such a general Superintendency over all particular Churches and their Pastors, by Virtue of their *Apostolical Authority* (founded on the unerring Assistance of the Holy Spirit promis'd to 'em) that all *particular Churches* and their *Pastors*, were oblig'd to receive the Commands of Christ from them as his *inspired Messengers*; they were empower'd to *rectify Abuses*, and censure *Male-Administrations* wherever they found 'em, and no *humane Compacts* or *Agreements* cou'd confine the Exercise of this *Universal Authority*, or limit it to *this* or that *particular District*. Nay, tho' the great Ends of their Apostolical Ministry, did oblige 'em as much as possible to *divide* their Labours, some of 'em travelling to some Parts of the Infidel World, others to other and remoter ones; yet wherever they came, tho' within the *Line* or *Precincts* where another Apostle had labour'd before, their Authority with respect to those Churches and their Pastors, was as *full* and *unlimited* as if they had been *converted* or *settled* by themselves. For their *unerring Assistance* and *Inspiration* empower'd 'em every where to *teach what Christ had commanded*, and consequently to rectify whatever they found in *Doctrine*, *Worship*, or *Practice* contrary to the *Orders* they had receiv'd from him. And if Mr. Dr — will now prove every *Bishop's* Authority to be as *Extensive* and *Unlimited* as this, he'll do something to the Purpose. But if any claim this *Unlimited Authority*, Mr. B. may still insist upon it, That they ought not only to pretend to the same *unerring Assistance* the Apostles had, but to produce *Miracles* as the *Credentials* of it. Other-  
wise

wife I am apprehensive, that no considerate Man will much regard so bold a Claim. But of this I shall have Occasion to speak more, when he comes to prove, the *Bishops* to be the *Apostle's Successors* in the whole of their *Apostolical Power*.

2. 'Tis by no Means true, That the *Limitation* of the Power either of *Bishops* or *Presbyters* (as to its ordinary Exercise) to a particular Charge, is wholly owing to voluntary Compact and Agreement.

For this *Limitation* of the ordinary Exercise of their Ministerial Office, is founded upon a more substantial Reason, viz. *The natural Incapacity of any one Man to discharge the ordinary Duties of the Pastoral Office towards either the whole Church or any extensive Part of it*: Thus no Man can at once be the Ordinary Teacher of many Congregations, or be their Ordinary Guides in Publick Worship. And shou'd he rashly undertake such a Charge, while he performs his Duty to one, the rest must of Course be woefully neglected. Nor can any one Man ordinarily exercise the Discipline of Christ, towards any considerable Number of particular Churches, as strictly as either the Rules of the Gospel, or the ancient Canons of the Church require. And therefore the Apostles whose great Work was to convert Infidels and plant Churches, never took on 'em a fixed Pastoral Relation to any particular Churches, (as Mr. Dr—— groundlessly suggests) nor indeed cou'd do it without neglecting the more important Service they were sent upon. For (as Mr. B. observ'd from Dr. Barrow) “ The  
“ Offices of an Apostle and Bishop are not well con-  
“ sistent. For the Apostleship is an extraordinary  
“ Office, charged with the Instruction and Government  
“ of the whole World, and calling for an answerable  
“ Care. (The Apostles being Rulers as St. Chrysostome  
“ saith ordain'd by God, Rulers not taking in several  
“ Nations or Cities, but all of 'em in common entrust-  
“ ed with the whole World.) But Episcopacy is  
“ an ordinary standing Charge, affix'd to one Place,  
“ and requiring a Special Attendance there. Bishops  
being



“ being Pastors who (as St. *Chrysostome* saith) do fit  
 “ and are employ’d in one Place. Now he that hath  
 “ such a general Care, can hardly discharge such  
 “ a particular Office, and he that is fixed to a particu-  
 “ lar Attendance, can hardly look after so general a  
 “ Charge. Either of those Offices alone would suffice  
 “ to take up a whole Man, as those tell us who con-  
 “ sider the Burthen incumbent on the meanest of ’em.  
 “ The which we may see describ’d in St. *Chrysostome*’s  
 “ *Discourses concerning the Priesthood*. What Mr. Dr—  
 objects against this, shall be farther consider’d in its  
 due Place.

3. If the *Division* of Churches into *Dioceses* and *Parishes* be not (as Mr. Dr.—owns) of *Divine Right*, Then the Office of *Diocesan Bishops* cannot be of *Divine Right*. And if the *Government* of such a Number of Churches be not (as he saith) *essential* to the *Episcopal Office*, Then every *Rector* or *Pastor* of a particular Church, that hath *Assistant Curates* or *Presbyters* may be as true a *Bishop*, as he that has a *Score* or an *Hundred* such Churches under his *Government*. And if in Fact, the *Primitive Bishops* were only the *Rectors* each of a particular Church or Congregation associated for *Personal Communion*, and having but one *Altar* or *Communion-Table*, having *Presbyters* as their *Assistants*; the Proof of the *Divine Right* of such *Bishops* will be so far from justifying the *Divine Right* of our present *Diocesans*, that it utterly overturns it. For if the Power of *Excommunication*, *Confirmation* and *Ordination* belong to every such *Congregational Bishop* by *Divine Right*, then the Power of a *Diocesan Bishop* that divests all these *Congregational Bishops* within such a District of their *Essential Rights*, which they shou’d enjoy by *Divine Institution*, and engrosses ’em into his own Hand, must on these Principles be an *Usurpation*. And therefore with respect to *Antiquity*, the Controversy does wholly turn upon the *Extent* of the *Bishops Charge*; the Power of *Congregational Bishops* being wholly inconsistent with that of a *Diocesan* one, and entirely swallow’d

swallow'd up by it. A *Congregational* and a *Diocesan Church* are of Two distinct *Species*, the Members of the *One* are capable of *ordinary, local, presential Communion*, the Members of the *other* are not. And for the *Bishops*, the *Offices* of the *one* and the *other* are quite different. The *Office* of a *Congregational Bishop* is personally to *teach, guide, and rule* a particular Church as his *stated Charge and Care*; the *Office* of a *Diocesan Bishop*, is to send *others* as his *Curates* to the several particular Churches in his District, and to divest them of their *ruling Power*, monopolizing the *Censures* of the Church to himself and his own Court. Nay, if the *Smallness* or *Largeness* of the Bishop's Charge be not *essential* to the *Episcopal Office*, it wou'd no way alter the *Episcopal Office*, if all our *Parish-Rectors* were made the only *Bishops*, and the *Diocesans* turn'd out. And on the other Hand, if the *Pope* cou'd turn all the Clergy thro' the *Romish Church* into meer *Curates* under him, it wou'd no way destroy the *Episcopal Office*. Nay, that one *Romish Church* wou'd be of the same *Species* with a *Congregational Church*; and the *Roman Bishop* one of the same *Order* as a *Congregational* or *Parish-Bishop*. (See *Mr. Baxter's Treatise of Episcopacy*, Part II. ch. 9. p. 87, 88, 89, 90, &c.) Nay, if a Man may be a *Bishop* tho' he has but one *Congregation* under his Charge, all the *Reformed Churches Abroad*, and all the *Protestant Dissenting Churches at Home* have such *Bishops* already. If *Mr. Dr* — say, they cannot be such, because they have not receiv'd the *Episcopal Order*; it is easily reply'd, they have receiv'd the *Episcopal Order* (including all the *Powers* of *Ruling, Ordaining* others as well as *Teaching* and *Administring the Sacraments*;) and that by the *Investiture* of such as were such *Bishops* themselves, and claim'd all these *Branches* of *Episcopal Power*. If he reply, that this *Episcopal Authority* cannot be conferr'd by any *Congregational Bishops*, but only by such *Diocesans* as have many Churches under their Government, then he makes the Government of a multiplicity of Churches *essential* to the *Episcopal Office*, quite

quite contrary to his own *Concession*; nay, then he entirely nullifies all or most of the *Ordinations* in the three First Centuries, which (as I shall hereafter shew) were only perform'd by *Congregational Bishops*, not *Diocesan* ones; so that Mr. Dr—— instead of defending the Cause of *Diocesan Bishops*, has by this one *Concession* given it up. And to convince him hereof, I would only propose one Question to him, Whether he think *Episcopacy* now abolish'd in *Scotland*? If it be not, Why is there such a Clamour rais'd against the *Establish'd Church* there on that Account? On the other Hand, How can he say, That they have abolish'd *Episcopacy*, when they have only reduc'd the Charge of every *Bishop* to a *single Congregation*; But still allow to every *Pastor* of such a Congregation all the *Powers* that can belong (by his Scheme) to the *Episcopal Office*? They have not therefore taken away the *Office*, but only narrow'd and confin'd the *Charge* of each *Bishop*, to the Limits to which it was ordinarily confin'd in the Three First Centuries. If he farther saith, That these *Congregational Bishops* have no *Presbyters* under 'em, 'Tis again replied, That the having *Presbyters* under him is not essential to a *Bishop's Office*. For Mr. Dr—— himself tells us, That where the Congregation was but *small* (as that of *Gregory Thaumaturgus* is said to be, consisting of no more than 17 Persons) a *Bishop* only was sufficient. And the ancient Writers mention it as no uncommon Case for many Churches, to have *Bishops* without any *Presbyters* at all.

The *Second Thing* premis'd by M. Dr—— relates to the *Distinction* commonly us'd between a *different Order* and a *different Degree* in the *same Order*.

That there is such a *Distinction* to be made is manifest from his own Case. He and another are *Assistant Curates* to the Reverend Dr. Travers. I presume if be he a *Presbyter*, he thinks himself of the *same Order* with the *Doctor*, and that no *Spiritual Powers* belong to the *Doctor's Office* that belong not to his. And yet I presume he will allow the *Doctor* some considerable *Superiority*



riority above himself and his *Fellow-Curate*, in managing the Affairs of that *Parish-Church*, and that he has a much higher Degree of *Authority* in his *Parish*, than they can pretend to. But as to this *Mr. B.* need not have any farther Debate with *Mr. Dr.* — because he does appropriate such Acts as those of *Confirmation*, *Excommunication*, and *Ordination* to the Office of a *Bishop*, and asserts that no *Presbyter* is impowr'd by his Office to perform 'em. And therefore he grants all that *Mr. B.* contends for, *viz.* That those who make *Bishops* a different Order from *Presbyters*, must suppose some Powers appropriated to them, which belong not to the Office of *Presbyters*. And 'tis this that he must produce us a *Divine Institution* for.

*Mr. Dr.* — having premis'd these Two Things, enters upon the main Business of this Chapter, *viz.* To prove, That *Episcopacy* was believ'd by the *Fathers* of the Church to be of *Divine Right*.

But before I enter on the Consideration of his Proofs, I must beg Leave to remind him what he is to prove, if he wou'd give us any rational Satisfaction in this Point. And I shall name the following particulars:

1. He must prove, That the *Fathers* thought it of *Divine Right*, That the Pastors of several Congregations (in each of which, all Parts of the Ordinary Worship of God, such as *Prayer*, *Praise*, *Preaching*, *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper* were administered) ought to be subject to One, as the Governor of those *Pastors*, and their several Congregations, to whom the Powers of *Confirmation*, *Excommunication*, and *Ordination* were appropriated.

2. That such *Bishops* claim'd a *Negative Voice* in all Acts of Church-Government, and particularly decreed the Sentence of *Excommunication* by their sole Authority. And reckon'd this of *Divine Right*.

3. That the decreeing that Sentence, was committed by such *Bishops* to *Civilians* as their *Delegates*.

Without proving the First of these Propositions, he entirely drops the *Diocesan Cause*. For if the *Superiority*

riority of such a Bishop over several such Congregations and their Pastors, be not of Divine Right, the present Diocesan Episcopacy is not. All the Presbyterian Churches Abroad and at Home have such Pastors as claim and exercise the foremention'd Powers of Excommunication and Ordination in their several Congregations: And were invested with such Powers by those that ordain'd 'em. And if this be sufficient to constitute 'em Bishops, tho' they have only such a narrow Charge, Then Mr. Dr—— may accuse some of 'em indeed for wanting such Presbyters as the Primitive Bishops commonly had (tho' not always) but he cannot charge 'em for wanting Bishops. And then all his Charge against 'em for rejecting Episcopal Government falls to the Ground.

And for the Two Latter Propositions, unless he proves them too, He must give up all Pretence of any Conformity of the present Episcopal Government to the Government of the Primitive Bishops, and drop his whole Argument from Antiquity.

And therefore his General Assertion, That the Fathers believ'd the Divine Right of Episcopacy, signifies nothing to the Decision of the Question in debate, unless he had told us, What kind of Episcopacy he meant, What was the Extent both of the Bishop's Charge and of his Power. For Congregational and Diocesan Episcopacy are so entirely distinct Things, that they are utterly inconsistent, the Power of the Diocesan being subversive of that of the several Congregational Bishops within his District.

But let us attend to the Testimonies from Antiquity, and see what they make for his Purpose.

He divides his Proof from Antiquity into Three Branches.

I. He undertakes to prove, That some of the First, the greatest and most learned Fathers of the Church do expressly say, That Bishops are by God's Appointment.

I must desire the Reader to remember, What Bishops he must mean, if he alledge their Testimony to any Purpose

Purpose for the *Divine Right* of the present Sort of *Episcopacy*, and now let us hear his Witnesses.

His First Witness is *Clemens Romanus* in the celebrated *Epistle*, which he writes in the Name of the *Church of Rome* to that of *Corinth*.

I will freely allow M. Dr—— all the Encomiums he bestows both on the *Writer* of this *Epistle*, and on the *Epistle* it self, and all the Force and Weight he lays upon it. But I can by no Means allow the unfair Representation he has given us of the Contents of it. And that I may not impose on the Reader's easy Credulity in that gross and shameful Manner he has done, but give him a just View of the Sentiments of that excellent *Writer*, I will transcribe all the *Passages* in that *Epistle*, that have the least Relation to the Matter in Debate, and then make some necessary *Animadversions* on the use that Mr. Dr—— wou'd make of *Clement's* Testimony in this Cause, and shew that 'tis not only unserviceable to his Purpose, but that if it prove any Thing, 'tis the quite contrary to what he pretends to draw from it.

*Clem. ad Corinth.*

(a) "All Things were done by you without respect of Persons: And you walk'd in the Commands of God, being subject to your Guides, and paying due respect to the more aged among you. You commanded the young Men to follow Things moderate and honest. You warn'd the Wives, that they

(a) Ἀρεστοπαλίπτως πάντα ἐποιεῖτε, καὶ τοῖς λόμοις τῶ Θεοῦ ἐπηρεᾶτε, ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν, καὶ πᾶσι τὴν κατὰ κυρίου ἀπομένοντες τοῖς παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέροις· ἵνα καὶ μετὰ καὶ σμῆνα νοεῖν ἐπιτρέπτε. γυναῖξιν τε ἐν ἀμαμῶν καὶ σμῆν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν πάντα ἐπιτελεῖν παρηγγέλλετε, σεργύου καὶ δικαίοντος τὸς ἀνδρας ἑαυτῶν· ἐν τῇ κατὰ κυρίου ὑποταγῇ ὑπαρχέας, τὰ κατὰ τὸν δαμον σμῆνως οἰκονομεῖν ἐδιδάσκατε, πάντα σωφρονέουσι. *Clementis ad Corinthios Epist. I. cap. 1. Edit. Joan. Clerici, inter Patres Apostolicos, fol. Antwerp. 1698. Vol. 1. pag. 145.*

"I should



" shou'd do all Things with a blameless, holy, and  
 " chaste Conscience, loving their Husbands as their  
 " Duty requires, and taught 'em that keeping within  
 " the Rule of Obedience, they shou'd manage their  
 " Household-Affair with all Temperance.

( b ) " Let us reverence our Guides, honour our  
 " Aged Men, instruct our young Men in the Fear of  
 " the Lord, make our Wives good, &c.

( c ) " Let us carry on our Warfare with all Di-  
 " ligence in his blameless Commands. Let us consider  
 " the Soldiers who obey their Leaders in War, how  
 " orderly, readily, and with all Subjection they exe-  
 " cute their Orders. All are not Prætors or Chiliarchs,  
 " nor Centurions, nor Commanders of Fifty, and so  
 " on. Every one performs in his Order and Station,  
 " what is commanded by the King and the Leaders.  
 " The Great cannot subsist without the Small, nor the  
 " Small without the Great, &c.

( d ) Let there-  
 fore

( b ) Τὰς προηγμένους ἡμῶν αἰδεσόμεν, τὰς πρεσβυτέρους  
 ἡμῶν τιμωόμεν, τὰς νέας παιδεύσωμεν τὴν παιδείαν τῆς φόβου τοῦ Θεοῦ.  
 τὰς γυναῖκας ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν διορθώσωμεθα, κ. τ. λ. Ibid.  
 cap. 21. pag. 159.

( c ) Στρατευώμεθα, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, μετὰ πάσης ἐντε-  
 νείας ἐν τοῖς ἀμφοῖς περὶ τὰς αὐτῶν. Κατανόησωμεν τὰς στρα-  
 τευώμενους τοῖς ἡγεμένους ἡμῶν, πῶς ὡς τάκτως, πῶς ὡς ἐκπικῶς, πῶς  
 ὑποταγμένως ἐπιτελέσῃ τὰ διατασσόμενα. Οὐ πάντες εἰσὶν ἐπαρχοί,  
 ἔδῃ χιλίαρχοι, ἔδῃ ἐκατόνταρχοι, ἔδῃ πεντηκόνταρχοι, ἔδῃ τὸ καθε-  
 ξῆς ἀλλ' ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι τὰ ἐπιτασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ βασι-  
 λέως καὶ τῶν ἡγεμένων ἐπιτελεῖ. Οἱ μεγάλοι δίχα τῶν μικρῶν ἐ-  
 δύνανται εἶναι, ἔδῃ οἱ μικροὶ δίχα τῶν μεγάλων. Ibid. cap. 37.  
 pag. 167.

( d ) Σωξέτω ἕν ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν χειρὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ὑπο-  
 τασσέτω ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, καθὼς καὶ ἐπέδῃ ἐν τῷ χεῖρισματι  
 αὐτοῦ ἰσχυρὸς μὴ τιμμελεῖται [ pro πλημμελεῖται vel ἀτιμμελεῖται ]  
 τὸν ἀδελφόν, ὁ δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἐντρέπεται τὸν ἰσχυρὸν ὁ πλείστος ἐπιχρηγείτω  
 τῷ πτωχῷ, ὁ δὲ πτωχὸς ἐνχαλεῖται τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δι' ἑ  
 ἀναπληρωθῇ

“fore the Body of Christ be preserv’d, and every  
 “one be subject to his Neighbour, according as he  
 “is plac’d by his Favour or Grace. Let not the  
 “Strong neglect the Weak, Let the Weak reve-  
 “rence the Strong. Let the Rich give to the Poor.  
 “Let the Poor praise God that he has rais’d up others  
 “to supply their Wants. Let the Wiseman manifest  
 “his Wisdom not in Words, but in good Works. Let  
 “not the Humble be a Witness for himself, but give  
 “others leave to witness for him. He that is Chaste,  
 “&c.

(e) “Since these Things are manifest to us, we ought  
 “from a due Inspection into the Depths of Divine  
 “Knowledge to do all those things orderly, which the  
 “Lord

ἐναπαληρωθῇ αὐτῷ τὸ ὑστέρημα· ὁ σοφὸς ἐνδεικνύδω τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ μὴ  
 ἐν λόγῳ, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς· ὁ ταπεινοφρονῶν μὴ ἑαυτοῦ μαρ-  
 τυρεῖται, ἀλλ’ ἑάτω ὑφ’ ἑτέρου ἑαυτὸν μαρτυρεῖσθαι. ὁ ἀγνός. κ. τ. λ.  
 cap. 38. Ibid.

(e) Προδύλων ἡμῶν ὄντων τέτων, καὶ ἐκκεχυφότες εἰς τὰ ἐσθλὴ  
 τῆς θείας γνώσεως, πάντα ταῖς ποιεῖν οφείλομεν, ὅσα ὁ δεσπότης ἐπι-  
 τελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν. Κατὰ χαίρους τεταγμένους τὰς τε προσφορὰς καὶ  
 λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ οὐκ εἰκὴ ἢ ἀτάκτως ἐκέλευσεν γίνεσθαι  
 ἀλλ’ ὡεισμένοις καιροῖς καὶ ὥραις. Ποῦτε καὶ διὰ πίνων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι,  
 θέλει, αὐτοὺς ὡεῖσιν τῇ ὑπερτάτῃ αὐτῷ βελήσει· ἵν’ ὁσῶς πάντα γινό-  
 μενα ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ, ὡς πρὸς δεκτὰ εἴη τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ. Οἱ ἔν τοις  
 προσεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιῶντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν, ἐν πρὸς δεκ-  
 τῇ τε καὶ μακάριον τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τῷ δεσπότη ἀκολουθεῖντες καὶ δια-  
 μαρτάνουσιν. Τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομένα εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς  
 ιερεῦσιν ἰδίος ὁ τόπος προσέτακται, καὶ λευῖταις ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπι-  
 κεῖνται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται.

Ἐκαστος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐχαρισεῖτω θεῷ ἐν  
 ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὡεισμένον τῆς  
 λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, ἐν σεμνότητι. Οὐ πανταχῶς, ἀδελφοί,  
 προσφέρονται θυσίαι ἐνδεδεγισμῶ, ἢ ὡχρῶν, ἢ περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ  
 πημιμελίας, ἀλλ’ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ· καὶ οὐκ ἐν παντί  
 τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ’ ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιάσθαι,  
 μωμοσκοπησῶν

“ Lord has commanded us to perform, To perform  
 “ Oblations and Religious Services at the appointed  
 “ Seasons. Neither wou’d he (*i. e.* the Lord) have  
 “ those Things manag’d rashly or irregularly, but at  
 “ determinate Times and Hours; and where and by  
 “ whom he wou’d have these Things manag’d, he him-  
 “ self has determin’d by his sovereign Will, that all  
 “ Things being perform’d in an holy Manner accord-  
 “ ing to his good Pleasure, might be acceptable to him.  
 “ They therefore that make their Oblations at the  
 “ Times fore-appointed, are accepted and bless’d. For  
 “ in following the Commandments of the Lord, they  
 “ do not go astray. For there are proper Offices as-  
 “ sign’d to the High-Priest, there is a proper Place  
 “ appointed for the Priests, and the Levites have their  
 “ Services incumbent on em. The Layman is oblig’d  
 “ to Lay-Duties. Let every one of you Brethren  
 “ abiding in his Order and Station, give Thanks to  
 “ God

μωμοσκαπηδὲν τὸ προσφερόμενον διὰ τῆς ἀρχιερείας καὶ τῶν περὶ τὴν  
 μένων λειτουργῶν. Οἱ ἐν οὖν τῷ καθήκον τῆς βελήτης αὐτῆς  
 ποιῶντες ἡ, δανάζον τὸ προσκυνοῦν ἔχουσιν. Οὐαί, ἀδελφοί, ὅσα  
 πλείονος κατηύωθον γνώσεως, τοσῶτα μάλλον ὑποκείμεθα κιν-  
 δύνῃ.

Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς κυρίας Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ,  
 Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστός ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐξεπέμφθη ὁ χριστός ἐν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ,  
 καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ. ἐγένοντο ἐν αὐφότερα ἐνταύτως ἐν δε-  
 λήματος Θεοῦ. Παρεγγέλιος ἐν λαβόντες καὶ πληροφορηθέντες διὰ  
 τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ πιστεύοντες τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ  
 Θεοῦ, μετὰ πληροφορίας πλούματος ἀγίου, ἐξηλθόντες εὐαγγελιζόμενοι  
 τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι. Κατὰ χώρας ἐν καὶ πόλεις  
 κηρύσσοντες, καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τὸ πνεύ-  
 ματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. καὶ τῷ ἔκ και-  
 νῶς ἐν τῷ δὲ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐγγράφῳ περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ διακόνων.  
 Οὕτως τὸ πᾶν λέγει ἡ γραφή· Καταστήσω τὸς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν  
 δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τὸς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει. *Ibid.* cap. 40, 41,  
 42. pag. 168.—170.



" God with a good Conscience, and with all due Deco-  
 " rum (or Gravity) keep within the prescribed  
 " Bounds of his Ministry. Brethren, The daily and  
 " perpetual Sacrifices are not offer'd in every Place,  
 " whether Eucharistical or Propitiatory, but only at  
 " *Jerusalem*. Nor is the Oblation there made in every  
 " Place, but at the Altar in the Court of the Temple, the  
 " Sacrifice being diligently inspected by the High-Priest  
 " and the aforesaid Ministers. They that do any Thing  
 " besides what is agreeable to his Will are punish'd  
 " with Death. You see Brethren, the greater Know-  
 " ledge we are priviledg'd with, we are liable to the  
 " greater Danger.

" The Apostles have preach'd the Gospel to us from  
 " Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God. For Christ was  
 " sent by God, the Apostles by Christ. And both  
 " were done orderly according to his Will. For the  
 " Apostles having receiv'd their Instructions (or Com-  
 " mands) and being rais'd to a full Assurance by the  
 " Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and being en-  
 " trusted with the Word of God, went out with a full  
 " Assurance of the Holy Ghost, declaring the glad  
 " Tidings of the coming of the Kingdom of God:  
 " And preaching thro' Countries, and Cities, they con-  
 " stituted the First-Fruits of their Ministry, for Bi-  
 " shops and Deacons of those that shou'd afterwards  
 " believe, having by the Spirit approv'd 'em. Nor is  
 " this any new Institution (or any *new Thing*):  
 " For many Ages ago it was written concerning Bi-  
 " shops and Deacons. For so the Scripture somewhere  
 " speaks, I will appoint their Bishops in Righteous-  
 " ness, and their Deacons in Faith (or Truth.) \*

---

\* 60 K. 17.

And having mention'd, Ch. 43. How the Tribe of Levi was chosen for the Priesthood by the budding of Aaron's Rod, he adds Ch. 44. (f) " And our Apostles  
 " knew by Jesus Christ our Lord, that a Contention  
 " wou'd arise about the Name (or on the Account) of  
 " Episcopacy, and for this Cause being endued with  
 " certain Fore-knowledge constituted the foresaid Per-  
 " sons, (*i. e.* the Bishops and Deacons) and more-  
 " over gave Order that other approved Men might suc-  
 " ceed in the Place of the Dead, and execute their Of-  
 " fice. Those therefore that were constituted by  
 " them, or afterwards by other famous Men with the  
 " Consent of the whole Church, and who have in a  
 " blameless Manner serv'd the Flock of Christ, in an  
 " humble peaceable Manner without any Stain or  
 " Blemish, and for a long Time have had a good Report  
 " of all, such we think cannot be cast out of their  
 " Office without Injustice. For it will be no small Sin  
 " if we cast those out of their Episcopal Office who  
 " have offer'd their Gifts (or discharg'd their Duties)  
 " in

(f) Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἐγνώσαν διὰ τῆς κυεῖς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ  
 χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἐξ ἑστῆς ἐπὶ τῆς ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς· διὰ ταύτην ἐν  
 τῷ αἵματι προέγνωσαν εὐληφίαν τελεῖαν, κατέστησαν τὰς προεργημένους,  
 καὶ μεταξύ ἐπνομιῶν διδάσκουσιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωται  
 ἕτεροι διδουκίμαστοι ἄνδρες, τῷ λειβεργίᾳ αὐτῶν. Τὰς ἐν κατα-  
 δέντας ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξύ ὑπὲρ ἐτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συν-  
 δοκασίας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πάσης, καὶ λειβεργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ  
 ποιμνίῳ τοῦ χριστοῦ μὴ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως καὶ ἀβανάντως,  
 μεμαρτυρημένους τε πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων, τέως ἐν δικαίᾳ  
 νομίζομεν ἀποβαλέσθαι τῇ λειβεργίᾳ. Ἀμαρτία γὰρ ἐμικρὸν ἡμῶν ἔσται,  
 ἐὰν τὰς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσῶς προσενέγκοντες τὰ δῶρα τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἀπο-  
 βάλλωμεν. Μακάριοι οἱ προσδοκῶντες προσεβύτεροι, οἵτινες ἐγ-  
 καρπον καὶ τελεῖαν ἔχον τῷ ἀνάλυσιν· ἐν γὰρ ἐνλαβῆνται μὴ τις αὐτοῖς  
 μέλας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδρυμένου αὐτοῖς τόπου. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐνίς ὑμεῖς  
 μεταγὰρτε καλῶς πολιδομένης, ἐκ τῇ ἀμέμπτως αὐτοῖς πεπημένης  
 λειβεργίας.

“ in an holy and unblameable Manner. Blessed are those  
 “ Presbyters that are gone before, and have obtain’d  
 “ a fruitful and perfect Dissolution. They are not  
 “ afraid least any shou’d remove ’em from the (happy)  
 “ Place in which they are fixed. But we see that you  
 “ have remov’d some of excellent Conversation from  
 “ the Ministry with which they are dignify’d, and  
 “ which they discharge without blame.

“ Ye are contentious, Brethren, and zealous of Things  
 “ not pertaining to Salvation. Look into the Scrip-  
 “ tures the true Oracles of the Holy Spirit. Learn that  
 “ there is nothing unjust or feigned contain’d therein.  
 “ For you will not find just Persons rejected by holy  
 “ Men. The Just have suffer’d Persecution, but ’tis  
 “ from the Wicked; they have been cast into Prison,  
 “ but it was by the Profane, &c.

( g ) “ Why are there Contentions, Wrath, Di-  
 “ visions, and Schisms and War among you? Have  
 “ we not one God and one Christ? Is there not one  
 “ Spirit of Grace pour’d out upon us, and one Cal-  
 “ ling in Christ? Why do we divide and tear the  
 “ Members of Christ, and move a Sedition against  
 “ our own Body, and come to that Madness as to for-  
 “ get

Φιλόνηκοι ἔσε, ἀδελφοί, καὶ ζηλωταὶ περὶ μὴ ἀνηκόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν.  
 Ἐσκύπτετε εἰς τὰς γραφάς, τὰς ἀληθεῖς ῥήσεις πνεύματος τῆς ἀγίας.  
 Ἐπίσαυτε ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀδικον, ἐπεὶ παραπεποιημένον γέγραπται ἐν αὐταῖς.  
 Οὐ γὰρ εὐρήσατε δικαίους ἀποβεβλημένους ἀπὸ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν. Ἐδιώχ-  
 θησαν δίκαιοι, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ἐφυλάχθησαν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ ἀνοσίων.  
 κ. τ. λ., *Ibid.* cap. 44, 45. pag. 171, 172.

( g ) Ἴνα πῆρεis, καὶ θυμοὶ, καὶ διχοστασίαι, καὶ ῥήσματα, πόλεμος  
 τε ἐν ὑμῖν; ἢ ἔχῃ ἓνα Θεὸν ἔχουμεν, καὶ ἓνα Χριστὸν; καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα  
 καὶ χάρις τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς, καὶ μία κλήσις ἐν Χριστῷ, ἵνα τι  
 διέλκομεν καὶ διασπῶμεν τὰ μέλη τῆς Χριστοῦ, καὶ πασιάζομεν πρὸς τὸ  
 σῶμα τὸ ἴδιον, καὶ εἰς τοσαύτην ἀπύνοϊαν ἐρχόμεθα, ὥστε ὀπλάδε-  
 σθαι ἡμᾶς ὅτι μέλη ἐσμέν ἀλλήλων; Μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τῆς  
 κυρίου ἡμῶν. Ἔειπε γὰρ Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ ὅπου ἐκείνῳ καλὸν ἢ τῷ αὐτῷ  
 εἰ



“ get that we are Fellow-Members? Remember the  
 “ Words of our Lord Jesus Christ; for he said, Wo to  
 “ him by whom Offences come, for it had been better  
 “ he had never been born, than that he shou’d offend  
 “ One of my Elect. He had better have a Millstone  
 “ hang’d about his Neck, and be drown’d in the Sea, than  
 “ that he shou’d offend (or occasion the Fall of) one of  
 “ my little Ones. Your Schism has perverted many, it  
 “ has cast some into Dejection, others into Doubting,  
 “ all of us into Sorrow, and yet your Sedition conti-  
 “ nues still.

“ Take the Epistle of blessed Paul the Apostle into  
 “ your Hands, what he wrote to you in the beginning  
 “ of his Gospel. For it was by the Inspiration of the  
 “ Holy Spirit, that he warn’d you of the Sidings and  
 “ Divisions among you concerning him, and *Cephas*,  
 “ and *Apollo*. But that Siding (or Division) was less  
 “ Sinful. Because ye then sided with famous Apostles,  
 “ and with a Man approv’d by them.

“ But

εἰ ἐκ ἐκνήθη, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν με σκανδαλίσει· κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ  
 περιεθῆναι μύλον, καὶ καλᾶπονηθῆναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν  
 μικρῶν με σκανδαλίσει. Τὸ κρίμα ὑμῶν πολλὰς διέσχευεν, πολ-  
 λὰς εἰς ἀθυμίαν ἔβαλεν, πολλὰς εἰς διαγμὸν, τὰς πάντας ἡμᾶς εἰς  
 λύπην· καὶ ἐπίμονος ὑμῶν ἔστιν ἡ σάσις.

Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῆς μακαρίας Παύλου τῆς ἀποστόλου. Τὴν  
 πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς εὐαγγελίας ἔγραψεν; ἐπ’ ἀληθείας πνευ-  
 ματικῶς ἐπέσειλεν ὑμῖν, περὶ αὐτῆς τε, καὶ Κηφᾶ, καὶ Ἀπόλλω, διὰ τὸ  
 καὶ τὸτε περισκλίσαις ὑμᾶς ποιῶνται· ἀλλ’ ἡ περισκλίσις ἐκείνη ἦτον  
 ἀμαρτίαν ὑμῖν προσήνεγκαν. Περισκελίθητε γὰρ ἀποστόλοις μεμαρ-  
 τυρημένοις, καὶ ἀνδρὶ δοκιμασμένῳ παρ’ αὐτοῖς. Νυκτὶ δὲ κατανόη-  
 σαι πνεν ὑμᾶς διέσχευεν, καὶ τὸ σκεπνὸν τῆς περιβοίης φιλαδελφίας  
 ὑμῶν ἐμείωσαν. Αἰχρᾶ, ἀραπῆλοι, καὶ λίαν αἰχρᾶ, καὶ ἀνάξια τ’ ἐν  
 χριστῷ ἀγωγῆς, ἀκέειται, τὴν βεβαιωτάτην καὶ ἀρχαίαν Κορινθίων  
 ἐκκλησίαν, δι’ ἣν ἡ δύο πρόσωπα, σπασάξεν πρὸς τὰς πρὸς βουλῆς.  
 Καὶ αὕτη ἡ ἀκοὴ ἐ μόνον εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐχώρησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὰς ἑτερο-  
 λινεῖς ὑπάρχοντας ἀφ’ ἡμῶν· ὥστε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρειται τῷ ὀνόματι

“ But now consider who have perverted you and  
 “ diminish’d the Glory of your celebrated Brotherly  
 “ Love. For we hear shameful, even very shameful  
 “ Things and unbecoming your Christian Conduct,  
 “ that the firm and ancient Church of the *Corinthians*,  
 “ has rais’d a Sedition against their Presbyters for the  
 “ Sake of one or two Persons. And this Rumour has  
 “ not only reach’d our Ears, but even the Ears of such  
 “ as in Point of Religion quite differ from us ; so that  
 “ thro’ your Folly the Name of the Lord is blasphem’d,  
 “ and your selves are indanger’d.

( b ) “ Whoever therefore is generous among  
 “ you, whoever is Merciful, whoever is full of Cha-  
 “ rity, Let him say, If the Sedition, Contention,  
 “ and Schisms arise on my Account, I will depart, I  
 “ will go away wherever ye please, and will do  
 “ whatever the Congregation shall appoint, only let  
 “ the Flock of Christ live in Peace with the Presby-  
 “ ters set over it. Whosoever will act thus, will gain  
 “ great Honour to himself in the Lord, and every  
 “ Place will readily receive him.

( i ) “ You therefore that have laid the first  
 “ Foundation of the Sedition, be subject to your Pres-  
 “ byters, and be nurtur’d to Repentance, bending the

κυρίῳ, διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀφροσύνην, ἑαυτοῖς ὃ κίνδυνον ἐπιξεραΐζετε.  
*Ibid.* cap. 46, 47. pag. 173, 174.

( b ) Τίς ἐν ὑμῖν γενναῖος ; τίς εὐσπλαγχνός ; τίς πεπληρομη-  
 μῆτος ἀγάπης ; ἐγὼ δὲ εἰς πάντας καὶ ἕως, καὶ ὀπίσσω, ἐκ-  
 χωρῶ, ἀπειμι, ἵνα εἰάν βέλῃτε, καὶ ποιῶ τὰ προσλασόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ  
 πλήθους· μόνον τὸ ποιμένιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰρηνεύτω, μετὰ τῶν καθεσ-  
 μένων πρεσβυτέρων. Τὸτο ὁ ποιήσας, ἑαυτῷ μέγα κλέος ἐν κυρίῳ  
 περιποιῖται, καὶ πᾶς τόπος θέξει αὐτὸν. *Ibid.* cap. 54. pag. 176.

( i ) Ὑμεῖς ἐν ἡμῖν θεμελίον τῆς σωτῆρος ποιήσαντες, ὑποτά-  
 γητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ παιδεύθητε εἰς μέλανον, κάμψαντες τὰ  
 γόνατα τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν, μάστιγι ὑποτάσσεται, ἀποθέμενοι τὴν  
 ἀλαζονίαν καὶ ὑπερήφανον τὴν γλῶσσαν ὑμῶν ἀνταΐσαν κ. τ. λ. *Ibid.*  
 cap. 57. pag. 178.

“ Knees

“ Knees of your Hearts. Learn to be subject, laying  
 “ aside all boasting and proud Arrogance of your  
 “ Tongue, &c.

Now upon the Review of these Passages in the Epistle of *Clemens*, I wou'd desire Mr. Dr—— to tell us, Where he finds in this Epistle, *That there was a Sedition rais'd by the Presbyters of Corinth against their Bishop?* Or *that the Presbyters grew insolent, and wou'd not be regulated by their Bishop in the Administration of the Sacrament?* And *that a few haughty Presbyters by emulating the Bishops Power, put the whole Church into Confusion?* Or that *Clement* plainly proves the Authority of the Bishop over the Clergy, as well as that of the Clergy over the Laity is by God's Appointment? I must tell him, That I have before I saw his Book read that Epistle twice over, and have since read it as often again, and can find no such Matter of Fact, mention'd in the Epistle it self as the Occasion of writing it. And if these be mere precarious Assertions of his own, which he groundlessly fathers upon that excellent Writer, What Excuse can he make for so notorious a Prevarication?

If he refer us (as he does) to p. 167. The Reader may by casting his Eye back upon it, plainly see, That there is nothing there mention'd more than a general Exhortation, That “ as Soldiers obey their Leaders in  
 “ War, so every one shou'd be subject to his Neighbour, accordingly as he is plac'd by the Favour and  
 “ Grace of God. 'Tis indeed possible, That *Clemens* might recommend to 'em hereby a Subjection to the Presbyters as their Spiritual Leaders. But he does not so much as mention that in his Application of it. But “ let the Weak reverence the Strong, Let  
 “ the Rich give to the Poor, &c. But of the Presbyter's being subject to the Bishop, there is not one Syllable to be there found.

If Mr. Dr——refer us to p. 168. &c. *Clemens* does indeed there recommend to 'em, the performing their Oblations and Religious Services at the appointed Times, and  
 tells



tells 'em, " The Lord wou'd not have those Things " done rashly or irregularly, but at determinate Times " and Seasons. And to that End, he recommends to 'em the Example of the *Jewish* Oeconomy in which the *Higb-Priest*, had his proper Offices assign'd him, the *Priests* had their proper Place appointed, and the *Levites* had their Services incumbent on 'em. And here Mr. Dr—— tells us, There is a plain Intimation of the *Divine Right* of the Subordination of *Bishops*, *Priests* and *Deacons* in the Church of Christ, as there was of *Higb-Priest*, *Priests* and *Levites* in the *Jewish* Church.

Now since this is the only Passage in that Epistle that can give the least Countenance to Mr. Dr——'s Cause, I shall suggest the following *Observations*, to convince him how groundless the Inference that he draws from it is.

1. *Clemens* does no where in that Epistle draw any such Parallel, between the *Higb-Priest*, the *Priests* and *Levites* in the *Jewish* Church, and the *Bishop*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* in the Christian Church. No more than he supposes as many distinct Officers in a Church, as those he mentions in an Army, as *Prætors*, *Chiliarchs*, *Centurions*, *Commanders of Fifty*, &c. On the contrary, When he mentions the *Officers* plac'd by the Apostles, both in the *Cities* and *Countries* where they publish'd the Gospel, and made Converts to the Christian Faith, he mentions only Two, viz. *Bishops* and *Deacons*, p. 170. And these *Bishops* he is so far distinguishing from *Presbyters*, That on the contrary, he supposes the *Presbyters* vested with the *Episcopal Office*, and blames the Church of *Corinth*, that they had cast their *Presbyters* out of their *Bishoprick* or *Episcopacy*, who had faithfully and blamelessly discharg'd their Function, p. 172. And he concludes the Epistle, with exhorting the Seditious Members of that Church to be subject to their *Presbyters*, without once exhorting 'em to be subject to their *Bishop* as a superior Officer, or exhorting the *Presbyters* to pay their due Deference to

to his Superior Authority. So that this pretended Subordination of *Bishop, Presbyters* and *Deacons* in that Church, is meerly feign'd by Mr. Dr——, not only without any ground from that Epistle, but in plain Contradiction to the whole Strain of it.

2. This Passage of *Clemens* concerning the *High-Priest*, the *Priests* and *Levites* in the *Jewish Church* may be easily accounted for, without the Supposition of any such Subordination.

If any exact Parallel be here intended, either the *Jewish Church* is here made the *Model* and *Pattern* of the *Catholick Church*, or of every such particular Church as that of *Corinth* was.

'Tis no way necessary nor indeed probable, That *Clemens* did intend here any exact Parallel between the *Jewish* and every particular Christian Church with respect to the Government of it. It was sufficient to his Purpose to shew, That as in the *Jewish Church* the *High-Priest*, the *Priests* and the *Levites* had their several Offices and Ministries assign'd; so there was a due Order constituted in every Christian Church, in which the Spiritual Guides of it, (*viz.* The *Presbyters* or *Bishops* of it, and the *Deacons*) had their Ministries assign'd as well as the *Laity* had their Duties to perform. And that the Observation of Due Order was as needful in Christian Churches as in the *Jewish Church*. And indeed had *Clemens* design'd to draw any exact Parallel, nothing cou'd be more absurd than to draw it with reference to such a particular Church as that of *Corinth* was, and the whole *Jewish Church*. For the *High-Priest* was One whose Office bare a Relation to the whole *Jewish Church*, and not to any one Synagogue or to a few Synagogues in one particular City, and the neighbouring Villages. And to talk of as many *High-Priests* as there were Cities in *Judaea*, wou'd have been ridiculous. And yet to make the Parallel good according to our *Author's* Interpretation of it, the whole *Jewish Church* must be suppos'd the Pattern of every particular Christian Church: But I hope Mr. Dr—— will

will not ascribe so palpable an Absurdity as this to so celebrated a Writer as *Clemens*.

On the other Hand, we may draw the Parallel exactly enough with reference to the *whole Christian Church*, of which the *Jewish* was an *Emblem*; for here, we have our *Blessed Saviour* the *High-Priest* of our Profession, who has his peculiar Ministrations for the whole Church in the heavenly Sanctuary; we have the *Bishops* or *Presbyters* as *Priests* under him, who have their Place assign'd in offering the Spiritual Sacrifices of the Flocks under their Care; and the *Deacons* as *Levites* to assist 'em in some lower Ministrations, such as the *serving of Tables*, while they *give up themselves to the Word and Prayer*. And here the Parallel is exact and full. But then it is so far from favouring Mr. Dr——'s Scheme, that it plainly overthrows it. And I may add for Confirmation of this Account, that *Clemens* never mentions any *single Person* as the Governour of that Church, but always speaks of their *Guides* or *Rulers* in the Plural Number (see p. 145 & 159.) much less does he give the Title of *High-Priest* to any such *single Person*. But he expressly gives that Title to our *Blessed Saviour* in the Close of that Part of his Epistle, in which he had recommended to the factious *Members* of the Church of *Corinth* a due Subjection to their *Presbyters*. See p. 180.

3. I may add, That tho' it cou'd be prov'd, (which I am satisfy'd can never be from any Thing in this Epistle) that St. *Clemens* did design to draw a Parallel between the Government of the *whole Jewish Church*, and that of such a *particular Church* as this of *Corinth*, it wou'd prove no more than some Superiority of a *Parochial Bishop* over his *Assistant-Presbyters*, and this (as I shall more fully shew hereafter) wou'd overturn instead of supporting the Pretensions of the *Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy*.

Again Mr. Dr—— argues from those Words of *Clemens*, p. 170. "That the Apostles preaching thro' Countries and Cities constituted the First-Fruits; of their



“ their Labours having made Proof or Trial of ’em by  
 “ the Holy Spirit to be Bishops (or Overseers) and  
 “ Deacons to them that shou’d afterward believe, al-  
 “ ledging that Passage, 6o 1st. 17. I will appoint ’em  
 “ Bishops in Righteousness, and Deacons in Truth.  
 And from that other Passage p. 171. “ The Apostles un-  
 “ derstood from our Lord Jesus Christ, that Strife and  
 “ Contention wou’d arise about the Name of Episco-  
 “ pacy, and therefore having absolute Fore-knowledge  
 “ hereof they ordain’d the foresaid Persons, and gave  
 “ [ἐπινομήν] a Description or Catalogue of Officers, as  
 “ Mr. Dr—— groundlessly translates the Words, where-  
 “ as the best Translators render it [Order or Direction]  
 “ that as some died, other approved Men might suc-  
 “ ceed and exercise their Office.

From hence Mr. Dr. argues, These Bishops were in  
 the Opinion of Clemens of Divine Appointment; and  
 that they are to be understood of Bishops as distin-  
 guish’d from Presbyters, he undertakes to prove by the  
 following Reasons:

1. Because (saith he) “ Clemens is speaking of the  
 “ Irregularity of some Presbyters of the Church of Co-  
 “ rinth, and advises ’em to keep in that Rank and Sta-  
 “ tion in which God had plac’d ’em, To observe in  
 “ one particular, a due Distance and Deference to  
 “ their Superiors in the Church according to God’s  
 “ Command, and not to administer the Holy Sacra-  
 “ ment, but in such Times and in such Places as the  
 “ Bishop directed ’em. And all this founded on this  
 “ solid Reason, because the Priests and Levites pay’d  
 “ the same Obedience to the High-Priest. Now if by  
 “ Bishops in this Place was meant meer Presbyters, the  
 “ Martyr’s Argument drawn from this Parallel of the  
 “ Jewish Church, wou’d have been very imperfect and  
 “ inconclusive.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. I must again challenge Mr. Dr—— to shew  
 me one Syllable in all this Epistle, wherein Clemens  
 charges any of the Presbyters of the Church of Corinth  
 with Irregularity. On the contrary, he applauds the  
 Presbyters

*Presbyters* for having *discharg'd* the *Duties* of their *Episcopal Function* in an *holy and unblameable Manner*, and on that Account aggravates the Crimes of those that wou'd cast them out of their *Episcopal Office*. And he no where distinguishes any *innocent Presbyters* from such as had been *faulty*; and much less is there the least Advice given to any of their *Presbyters*, to administer the *Sacrament* only at such *Times and Places* as the *Bishop* shou'd assign 'em: Nor is there in the whole *Epistle*, the least mention of a *Bishop* as one of *superior Order* in that Church, to whom they were to observe a due *Distance and Deference*. And for that Passage that relates to the *High-Priest, Priests, and Levites*, I have already shew'd that it implies no such *Subordination* of *Officers* in every *Christian* or *City-Church*. And is not this a very convincing way of *Arguing*, First to feign a *Matter of Fact*, of which there is not the least *Shadow* in that *Epistle*, and then draw such *Inferences* from it. as he thinks will favour his Cause? And may we not with much greater Reason and Force retort the Argument, That *Clemens* never once in that *Epistle* exhorts either *Presbyters* or *People*, to be subject to the Authority of any *single Bishop* as chief Governor in that Church, nor saith the least Word that shou'd intimate, there was any *Bishop* among 'em, tho' there was great Occasion for it; therefore there was none. But of this I may take more Notice anon. What Mr. Dr — adds under this Head, to account for only *Bishops* and *Deacons* being mentioned by *Clemens*, I shall consider when I come to argue from it.

His Second Reason is, That *St. Clement's* Application of the Prophecy out of *Isaiah* in this Place, seems to limit the Signification of *Bishops* to this Sense, because both *St. Jerome* and *St. Cyril* expound it of *Bishops* as a *Superior Order*.

*Answ.* That *St. Jerome* did think the *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, the same Office and Order in the *Apostle's* Time, I shall have Occasion to shew afterwards, and therefore he cannot consistently with himself, apply this  
Prophecy

*Prophecy to Bishops as a Superior Order.* Nor will it follow, that because such *Writers* as liv'd after the Distinction had obtain'd in the Church, apply'd this Text of *Esay* to *Bishops* as a *Superior Order*, That *Clemens* must apply it in the same Sense, in whose Time no such *Distinction* appears, but many Things in this very Epistle very inconsistent with it. And I can produce him an elder Writer than either of 'em; viz. *Irenæus*, who applies this Prophecy of *Esay* to *Presbyters*. *Tales Presbyteros nutrit Ecclesia de quibus & Prophetæ ait, & dabo Principes tuos in pace & Episcopos tuos in justitia*, *Iren. Adv. Hæres. lib. 4. c. 44*— (of which I may have Occasion to take further Notice) 'tis sufficient to observe from it, That *Irenæus* understood no other *Bishops* than *Presbyters* to be intended by the Prophet; and as he liv'd much nearer to the Time wherein *Clemens* flourish'd, than *St. Cyril*, so we may much more safely judge of the Sense of *St. Clemens* from *Irenæus* than from *Cyril*.

His Third Reason is, "That Bishop *Morton* tells us, Mr. *Young* the Publisher of that Epistle has explain'd the most difficult Part of it for the Cause of *Episcopacy*, observing from *Clement's* Word ἐνομήν, i. e. Description, That 'tis no more than the *Census* in *Tertullian*, by which it appears to have been a Custom in the Apostolical Churches, to write a Roll of the Order of Bishops in their Successions, to bring 'em from their *Originals* (as *Tertullian* speaks.) *Polycarpus* was from the Apostle *John* in the Church of *Smyrna*, and *Clement* in the Church of *Rome* from *Peter*, and others whom the Apostles constituted *Bishops*, from whom others might deduce their Traduction and Offspring.

*Ans.* If Mr. *Young* the Publisher of this Epistle, have any other Arguments to draw from it for the Cause of the Divine Right of *Diocesan Episcopacy*, I hope Mr. *Dr.*— has taken Care to collect 'em. But for this that he here produces, Mr. *Young's* Commentary instead of explaining the Text, does but obscure and perplex



plex it; The Words of *Clemens* are clear enough, if we render the Word *ἐμποιᾷ* Order, or Direction, viz.  
 " That the Apostles knowing that a Contention wou'd  
 " arise about the Name of Episcopacy, and for this  
 " Cause being endued with certain Fore-knowledge,  
 " constituted the foresaid Persons, ( i. e, Bishops and  
 " Deacons ) and moreover gave Order, that other approved Men might succeed in the Place of the Dead, and execute their Office. Those therefore that were constituted by them, or afterwards by other famous Men with the Consent of the whole Church, and who have in a blameless Manner serv'd the Flock of Christ in an humble and peaceable Manner, without any Stain or Blemish, and for a long Time have had a good Report of all, such we think cannot be cast out of their Office without Injustice. For it will be no small Sin, if we cast them out of their Episcopal Office, who have offer'd their Gifts ( or discharg'd their Duties ) in an unblameable Manner. Blessed are those Presbyters that are gone before, and have obtain'd a fruitful and perfect Dissolution. They are not afraid lest any shou'd remove 'em from the Place wherein they are fix'd. But we see that you have remov'd some of excellent Conversation, from the Ministry with which they were dignify'd, and which they discharg'd without Blame.

As the Words are thus render'd, the Sense runs clear and smooth; that as the Apostles themselves constituted *Bishops* and *Deacons* in the Churches they erected, so they gave Order that other approved Men shou'd upon their Death succeed. And such as were thus by the *Apostles*, or by other famous Men set over the Churches with their own Consent, ought not to be displac'd while they faithfully discharg'd their Duty. And this *Clemens* supposes to be the Case of these *Presbyters* of *Corinth*, whom the seditious Members of that Church wou'd unjustly cast out of their *Episcopal Office*. So that these *Presbyters* are evidently the *Bishops* whom

*Clemens*

*Clemens* supposes to be set over that Church of *Corinth*, pursuant to the *Example* and *Order* of the *Apostles*, and of whose unjust Exclusion he complains.

But let us now consider, what Sense we shall make of the Words with this new Comment of Mr *Young*'s. And they must then run thus; "That the *Apostles* "foreseeing a Contention wou'd arise about the Name "of *Episcopacy*, and for this Cause being endued "with certain Fore-knowledge, constituted the fore- "said Persons (*i. e.* *Bishops* and *Deacons*) and more- "over gave a *Roll* or *Catalogue* of Officers that other "approv'd Men, might succeed in the Place of the Dead "and execute their Office, &c.

Now against this Comment I have the following Objections to offer.

Either the Meaning of this is, That the *Apostles* when they constituted any *Bishops* and *Deacons* in the Churches they planted, by Virtue of their Fore-knowledge gave 'em a *List* or *Roll* of their Successors, or that they order'd, That the Names of these *Bishops* and *Deacons*, and of their Successors, shou'd be set down in such a *List* or *Roll* to be kept and preserv'd among 'em.

If the Meaning be, That when the *Apostles* constituted *Bishops* and *Deacons* in any Churches, they did by Virtue of their Fore-knowledge give 'em a *List* and *Roll* of their Successors, then the Assertion is liable to these insuperable Objections;

That it supposes a Matter of Fact utterly improbable without the least Evidence of it; *viz.* That the *Apostles* when they constituted *Bishops* and *Deacons* in the Churches they planted, gave 'em a *Catalogue* or *Roll* of their Successors. But who ever heard of such a *Roll* or *List*? Was it a *Catalogue* of all their Successors to the *World's End*? or a *List* of their Successors for one, two, or three Centuries? How came this *Roll* or *List* to be lost, when the Preservation of it wou'd have been of such vast Consequence to prevent all such Disputes about future *Elections*? For doubtless, the Churches wou'd have readily concurr'd in the Choice

of such as the *Apostles* from certain *Fore-knowledge* had mark'd down for their *Bishops* and *Deacons*. So that 'tis certain, either this *Catalogue* was never given by 'em, or those Churches to whom it was given were guilty of inexcusable Negligence, in suffering so valuable a *Roll* that wou'd have clear'd the *uninterrupted Line of Episcopal Succession* beyond Dispute, to be so utterly lost, that no Notion, no Monument of it shou'd be heard of to this Day, and no *Bishop* ever once appeal to it to justify his Claim against his Competitors.

2. The Words of *Clemens* are not consistent with this Comment of Mr. Young's. For what Occasion were there of the *Approbation* of the *Successors* to the *Apostolical Bishops*, if the *Apostles* themselves had already nam'd 'em? And what need was there of the Churches Consent to their taking the Oversight of 'em? Wou'd any of the Churches ever Dispute the Nomination of these their *inspired Founders* which they made from certain *Fore-knowledge*? Nay,

3. If the *Apostles* gave such a *Roll* or *List*, 'tis manifest by what follows, That *Presbyters* were the *Bishops* that they gave such a *Roll* or *List* of. And that these *Presbyters* of *Corinth* as well as of other Churches, were in the *List*. For 'tis of their Ejection from their *Episcopal Office*, that *Clemens* complains in the Close of this very Paragraph, in which he supposes that they acted contrary to this *Apostolical Order*, (or as Mr. Dr— calls it, this *Apostolical Roll*.) So that Mr. Young's Comment it self, utterly destroys all Pretence of *Episcopacy's* being a *Superior Order* by *Divine Institution*, since *Clemens* mentions no *Roll* of any other *Bishops* than *Presbyters*.

But the Truth is, The *Roll* it self is just such another imaginary Supposition, as the *Sedition* of the *Presbyters* of *Corinth* against their *Bishop*. And therefore I shall lay no Stress on the Argument drawn from it, tho' retorted with the justest Ground. And for *Tertullian's Censur*, I shall account for it when I come to consider his Testimony, and shew how little it signifies to  
Mr. Dr—'s



Mr. Dr——'s Purpose. But 'tis manifest from what I have said, That *Clemens* never dream'd of any such Roll here.

On the other Hand, if the Meaning be, That when the *Apostles* constituted any *Bishops* and *Deacons* in the Churches planted by 'em, they order'd that their Names and those of their *Successors*, shou'd be set down in a certain *List* or *Roll*, besides the gross Impropriety of Speech that St. *Clemens* is suppos'd guilty of, (for to give a *List* of *Successors*, is a quite different Thing from ordering others to make a *List* of 'em.) 'Tis here evident, that the *Apostles* according to St. *Clemens*, order no Names to be inserted in that *List* or *Roll* but those of *Bishops* and *Deacons*. But why shou'd not the Names of the *Presbyters* be inserted in the *Roll*, as well as that of *Deacons* to whom they were all (as all confess) superior? If indeed *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were the same, then the Reason of this Order is very accountable; but then Mr. Dr——'s Cause is overthrown. But if the *Bishops* be here distinguish'd from *Presbyters*, let Mr. Dr—— assign us any tolerable Reason, Why their Names must be buried in Silence, and those of the *Deacons* (a lower Order) kept as a perpetual Record? St. *Clemens* is hereby made a fair Advocate for the Cause of these injur'd *Presbyters* of *Corinth*, when he puts such an unsufferable Affront as this upon 'em. Nay, how comes it that no *Bishop* of this Church of *Corinth* appears in the *Roll*, as far as we can learn from this Epistle?

His Fourth and last Reason is drawn from those Words of *Clemens*, " That the Apostles foreseeing the " Contention that there wou'd be about the Name or " Office of *Episcopacy*, for this very Reason appointed " the foresaid Officers, viz. *Bishops* and *Deacons*. Now " (saith Mr. Dr——) The Contention rais'd by the " *Corinthian Presbyters* about *Episcopacy*, was concern- " ing the Power and Dignity of *Bishops*, which there- " fore the Apostles had ordain'd as they themselves " had been before ordained of God. And therefore

“ the Drift and Intent of the *Martyr* in this Place, is  
 “ to teach these *busy Presbyters* their Duty, and to keep  
 “ ’em in their Rank and Station. For had this Strife  
 “ and Contention been only about the *Presbyters*,  
 “ which the *Laymen* had unjustly depos’d, I cannot  
 “ see any Reason for *St. Clement’s Conclusion*. Had this  
 “ been the only Strife, it had not any way concern’d  
 “ the Name or Dignity of *Episcopacy*. Nay, if we take  
 “ the Word *Episcopacy* for *Presbytery* (as some Men  
 “ wou’d have us,) I cannot see how it will mend the  
 “ Matter, because the Quarrel in their Sense was not  
 “ about the Name, but the *Persons* of those *Presbyters*,  
 “ whom they thought unworthy, and therefore had  
 “ depos’d. So that to make any tolerable Sense of  
 “ this *Epistle*, we must understand the *Martyr* to have  
 “ meant *Bishops*, *Bishops* properly so call’d as they were  
 “ distinguish’d from *Presbyters*. And if Mr. B. had care-  
 “ fully read or wou’d believe any Thing of Antiquity,  
 “ he might have found, that *St. Clement* was at that  
 “ Time Bishop of *Rome*, and *Silas* of *Corinth*.

*Ans.* That there was any such Contention rais’d  
 by those *Corinthian Presbyters* concerning the Power  
 and Dignity of *Bishops*, that shou’d occasion *St. Clemens*  
 to teach those *busy Presbyters* their Duty, is wholly  
 Mr. Dr——’s Invention, without any Shadow of Proof  
 from the *Epistle* (as I have already observ’d.) Nay, ’tis  
 inconsistent with several Passages in the *Epistle*. For  
 can any one imagine, That he shou’d give the *Pres-*  
*byters* of *Corinth* without any Distinction such a Chara-  
 cter, as that they had discharg’d their Duty in an un-  
 blameable Manner, if they had been guilty of any  
 such Disobedience to a *Bishop*, whom *St. Clemens*  
 suppos’d by Divine Right their Superior? And that  
*St. Clemens* makes any Distinction among these *Pres-*  
*byters*, by charging some of ’em as Faulty, and com-  
 mending others of ’em as innocent in their Conduct, is  
 a Supposition that has no Foundation from any Thing  
 in that *Epistle*. Much less can it be suppos’d, that  
*Episcopacy* as a Superior Order and Office, was the Occa-  
 sion

sion of the Contest, when St. Clemens supposes Episcopacy to be the very Office of these Presbyters, and charges it on the Members of the Church of Corinth that they had cast their Presbyters out of their Episcopacy, or Episcopal Office. But saith Mr. Dr—— Vindic. p. 42. Clemens had made towards the Beginning of this Epistle, a manifest Distinction between Bishops and Presbyters. For Proof whereof he alledges these two Passages: “ Thus saith Clemens, cap. 1. being subject to those who  
 “ are set over you, [or Bishops,] and having your Presby-  
 “ ters in Honour. And Cap. 21. Let us Reverence our  
 “ Bishops, and Honour our Presbyters.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. I must confess my self surpriz’d at the unusual Assurance wherewith Mr. Dr—— asserts Clemens to have here made a manifest Distinction between Bishops and Presbyters. If I charge him with either want of Judgment or Sincerity, he’ll think I use hard Words. But how he will clear himself, I must leave the Reader to judge, when I have laid the entire Passages before him as they stand in that Epistle. They are these,

Cap. 1. “ All Things were done by you without re-  
 “ spect of Persons. And you walk’d in the Commands  
 “ of God, being subject to your Guides, [ τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ]  
 “ paying due Respect to the more Aged among you [ τοῖς  
 “ παρ’ ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέραις ] you command the [ τοῖς νεοῖς ]  
 “ young Men to follow Things sober and honest, you warn’d  
 “ the Wives that they shou’d do all with a blameless, ho-  
 “ ly, and chaste Conscience, loving their Husbands, &c.

Cap. 21. “ Let us love our Lord Jesus Christ,  
 “ whose Blood was given for us, let us reverence our Guides  
 “ or Leaders [ ἀγωνυμένους ] let us honour our Elders ( or  
 “ aged Persons ) πρεσβυτέρους, Let us instruct our Youth  
 “ [ νέους ] in the Nurture of the Fear of the Lord. Let  
 “ us direct ( or amend ) our Wives to that which is  
 “ good, &c.

’Tis so manifest here, That πρεσβυτέραις signifies aged Persons as oppos’d to the νέου or Younger, that the Oxford Editor (how eager soever he appears in his Notes for the Episcopal Cause) durst not venture upon so



gross a *Blunder* or *Prevarication*, as to translate the Word here *Presbyters*, as he does wherever *Clemens* speaks of the *Presbyters* as *Officers* in that Church of *Corinth*) But in both Places renders it *Seniores* or *Elder Persons*, as easily seeing that in both *Passages* the *ἡλικιωτες* or *Aged Persons* are not oppos'd to the *Laity* but to the *young Men*. And I need no more to convince Mr. Dr — himself of it, than to shew him, that his Sense of it is inconsistent with his own Hypothesis. He tells me, *Silas* was then proper *Bishop* of *Corinth* (in the modern Sense) How comes *Clemens* then to be so forgetful of his singular *Dignity* in that Church of *Corinth*, as to commend them for being subject to their *Guides*, if by *Guides* he meant such *Bishops*? Had they more *Bishops* than *One*? What becomes then of their grand *Maxime* of *One Bishop only in every City-Church*, as the *Principle* and *Center of Unity* to it? Or had this *Bishop* several *Coadjutors* in his Office, himself retaining only a *Primacy* of Order among 'em? I am afraid, this will amount to no more than a *Colledge* of *Presbyters* in our Sense with their *Preses* or *Moderator*. So that upon the Whole, I must advise Mr. Dr — to drop this Distinction, which is so far from being manifest from these *Passages*, that 'tis inconsistent with them.

But if *Clemens* knew of no other *Episcopacy* than what belongs to *Presbyters*, Mr. Dr. — objects, “ That if we take *Episcopacy* for *Presbytery*, he cannot see how this will mend the Matter, because the Quarrel in their Sense was not about the Name, but the Persons of those *Presbyters* whom they thought unworthy, and therefore had depos'd.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. But how does Mr. Dr — prove, That these seditious Members of that Church only oppos'd the Persons of their *Presbyters*, not their Office and Authority. *Clemens* no where mentions any Objection they made against their Doctrine or Practice: But on the contrary supposes 'em blameless with respect to both, and on that Consideration aggravates their Guilt in casting 'em out of their *Episcopal Office*. 'Tis therefore much

much more probable, That their Quarrel was about the Office it self, and that the *Members* of that Church were grown too proud and conceited, to be subject to the *Pastoral Authority* of their *Spiritual Guides*, as thinking themselves as *wise* as their *Teachers*, and too good to be subject to their Authority, And therefore when *Clemens* in the Conclusion of this Epistle urges those *seditionous Persons* to be subject to their *Presbyters*, he saith, " Wherefore laying aside all vain-glorious " and proud Arrogance of your Tongue, learn to be " subject to others. For 'tis better to be found little, " and of good Esteem in the Fold of Christ, than to be " cast out of your Christian Hope, by affecting to ap- " pear more eminent than others. So that the Con- tention which *Clemens* mentions, was not about *Episco- pacy* as an Office superior to that of *Presbyters*; for he supposes these very *Presbyters* cast out of their *Episco- pacy*, but about the *Authority* of *Episcopal Presbyters*, or *Presbyter Bishops* as they were distinguish'd from the *Laitie*, For so *Clemens* himself seems to state the Contest, when he requires the *Lay-man* to attend the *Duties of his Station*, cap. 40. And if any one consider, how common *extraordinary Gifts* had been in this Church (as we may see 1 Cor. 14.) and what Restraint the Apostle *Paul* thought needful to lay on the Exer- cise of 'em; 'tis no wonder that the *Members* of it shou'd be so forward to dispute the *Authority* of their *Pastors*, and to raise *Factions* against 'em, especially when we add, how little there was then of any Advantages of a learn- ed Education to distinguish the *Clergy* from the *Laitie*, And 'tis evident, That the Apostle himself had occa- sion before to curb the Pride of the *Members* of this Church, that wou'd have left little or no Distinction between *them* and their *Teachers*. *Are all Apostles?* *Are all Prophets?* *Are all Teachers?* 1 Cor. 12. 29. And by their rash Ejection of their *Presbyters* which *Clemens* here reproves 'em for, it is reasonable to conclude, that this levelling Humour was not quite extinguish'd, that wou'd have confounded the *People* with their *Spiritual Guides*

*Guides*, whose several *Duties* *Clemens* therefore is careful to distinguish, *cap.* 43.

Or if we allow the *Apostles* a prophetic Spirit, we may thus Account for the Sense of that Passage, "That the *Apostles* foreseeing there would be a Contention about the *Name* of *Episcopacy* (i. e. by one Man's engrossing both the *Name* and *Authority* to himself to the Prejudice of the *Rights* of his *Collegues* and *Brethren*) constituted the foresaid *Bishops* and *Deacons* (in all the Churches they planted, whether in *Cities* or *Countries*) and gave Order that other approved Men might succeed in the Place of the Dead, and execute their Office. But alas! neither their *Constitution*, nor our Saviour's own *Caution* against *striving who should be greatest*, could prevent the Effects of humane Ambition, and hinder Men of *Diotrephes's* Spirit from *aspiring after Prebeminence*. And if this Paraphrase be allow'd, which is much more conformable to the Strain of that Epistle of *Clemens* then what he offers, Then this Passage is a clear Testimony against the Pretension of the *Divine Right* of *Modern Episcopacy*.

Having thus overturn'd all Mr. Dr——'s unsuccessful Attempts to prove the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy* as a *superior Order* from this Testimony of *Clemens*, I may with the greater Advantage propose the Arguments it affords against that Opinion. As

1. 'Tis evident from this Epistle, That *St. Clemens* when he mentions the *Officers* whom the *Apostles* constituted both in *Cities* and *Countries*, where they brought in any considerable Number of Converts, mentions only *Bishops* and *Deacons*.

This Omission of *Presbyters* Mr. Dr—— pretends to account for several Ways.

The 1<sup>st</sup> is, "Because the *Deacons* did in this common Broil constantly adhere to their *Bishop*, when as so many *Presbyters* were in opposition."

*Answ.* This *Evasion* is founded on a meer Imagination of Mr. Dr——'s, The *Epistle* neither mentioning any *Bishop* at *Corinth*, (as distinct from the *Presbyters* there



there) nor any *Adherence* of the *Deacons*, or *Opposition* of any *Presbyters* to him. And I must beg Mr. Dr——'s pardon, if I take not such feigned Matters of Fact for *Arguments*. Besides, whatever the Carriage of the *Presbyters* of *Corinth* was, will it excuse *Clemens* for omitting a whole Order of *Ecclesiastical Persons*, when he sets himself to give an Account of the *Apostolical Constitution* of the *Churches* they founded? Shou'd the Crime of these particular *Presbyters* provoke him to suppress the mention of their Order, when he undertakes to tell us, How the *Apostles* modelled the Government of those Churches they planted? Or can his high Character and Elogium of the *Presbyters* of *Corinth* consist with the Supposition of such a Crime?

His next *Evasion* is, "That *Bishops* at First had more use of *Deacons* than of *Presbyters*."

*Answ.* If the *Bishops* had no Use of *Presbyters*, they cou'd not be *Diocesan Ones*, nor have many *Churches* under their Government. And that entirely ruins Mr. Dr——'s Cause. But we are sure, The *Apostles* ordain'd *Presbyters* in every *Church* and every *City*; How come they then to be so *useless* and *needless* Creatures in St. *Clemens*'s Time, that were thought so necessary in St. *Paul*'s? And why may we not much better say, That where there were several *Presbyters*, any such superior Officer as a *Bishop* was much more *useless* and *needless*? St. *Paul* seems to have been of that Mind, when he committed the Government of the Church of *Ephesus* to the *Elders*, and that as a *Remedy* against *Errors* and *Schisms*, and gave it as his last Charge to 'em.

xx *Acts* 28.

His next *Evasion* is, "That perhaps by *Deacons*, *Clemens* meant both *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, the Word *Minister* being applicable to both. The *Presbyters* and *Deacons* being both but subservient Ministers to the *Bishop*, who did allot 'em out their Turns and Stations in the officiating of God's *Divine Service*, the *Presbyters* having not yet assign'd 'em their particular Bounds,

" &c.

*Answ.*

*Answ.* What *Testimony* may not this Gentleman elude, if we will allow him all his *precarious Suppositions*? And why may he not as well pretend, That when the Apostle *Paul* directs his *Epistle* to the *Bishops* and *Deacons*, as well as Saints at *Phillippi*, That he includes the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* under the Name of *Διακονοι* or *Ministers*? No doubt he wou'd pretend this, were there not a small *Objection* against it, that then he must allow more *Bishops* than *One* in that Church. And this wou'd overturn his whole Scheme.

What he means by the *Presbyters* not having their *Bounds* yet assign'd 'em, I cannot tell. If he means, that the Church of *Corinth* was only a single *Congregation*, that had no *Assembly* subordinate to the *Bishop's* Church to officiate in, then had there been such a *Bishop* (as it no ways appears there was from any Thing in the *Epistle*) he must have been only a *Parochial* one. But if the *Apostolical Bishops* were only *Parochial* or *Congregational*, the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy* is destroy'd. And if *Clemens* speaks of such single *Congregations*, then he supposes several *Bishops* (not one single *Bishop*) set over 'em; and this *Supposition* also destroys Mr. Dr——'s Cause, and shews, That *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were then only different Names of the same *Office* or *Order*. And so *St. Clemens* supposes 'em to be, when he makes *Episcopacy* to be the *Function* of these *Corinthian Presbyters*.

His last *Refuge*, to which he chiefly trusts is, "That  
 " *St. Clemens* had no *Occasion* in this Place to mention  
 " *Presbyters*, because he was speaking to the *Presbyters*  
 " themselves, and advising them to submit to their  
 " *Bishop*, because God had appointed *Bishops* and *Deacons*  
 " as well as them.

*Answ.* I must again desire Mr. Dr—— to tell us, where *Clemens* gives any such Advice to the *Presbyters* of *Corinth* to submit to their *Bishop*? For I cannot find one Syllable to that Purpose. Nor can I find that *Clemens* addresses himself directly to the *Presbyters* themselves in the whole *Epistle*, tho' he so fully plead their Cause

Cause against those that wou'd injuriously cast 'em out. And must we always be put off with this Gentleman's *meer Inventions for Arguments*? Nay, since it was the Cause of the *Presbyters* at *Corinth*, that *Clemens* is here pleading against the Attempts of the mutinous *Laity*, he had the greatest Occasion possible to mention *Presbyters* as *Officers of Divine Appointment*, if he had thought 'em a *distinct Order* from *Bishops*. For this the People needed most to be told of to repress their Sedition against them.

These different Accounts Mr. Dr—— gives of *Clement's* pretended Omission being *meer Evasions*, the true and genuine Account remains, That *Clement's* knew of no other *Presbyters* but what were *Bishops*.

2. And this Argument from *St. Clemens* only mentioning *Bishops* and *Deacons* as *Officers constituted by the Apostles in the Churches they planted*, is the Stronger, if we consider, That he calls the Office of the *Presbyters* by the Name of *Episcopacy*, and supposes the *Presbyters* of *Corinth* to be cast out of their *Episcopal Office*. And how this can consist with his making a manifest Distinction between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, Let Mr. Dr—— at his Leisure resolve us.

3. I wou'd desire the Reader to compare *St. Clemens's* Assertion concerning the Apostles constituting *Bishops* and *Deacons* in the Churches they planted, with the Account which *St. Luke* gives of the Apostles ordaining *Elders in every Church*, and with the Direction *St. Paul* gives to *Titus* to ordain *Elders in every City*, and with the *Bishops* and *Deacons* at *Philippi*. And add thereto, That not only the Name but the Qualifications and Office of the Scriptural *Elder* and *Bishop* were the same; and it will thence manifestly appear, That *St. Clemens* speaks of the same Order of Men with *St. Luke* and *St. Paul*, and both of such Pastors as had the Joint-care and Charge of particular Congregations.

4. I wou'd add one Argument more that is of great weight with me, tho' only a Negative one.

'Tis manifest to any one that reads that *Epistle*, That  
St. Clem



St. *Clemens* never takes the least Notice of any *Bishop* in the Church of *Corinth*, as superior to, and distinct from *Presbyters*. Mr. Dr—— has indeed found out “ That the *Deacons* of *Corinth* sided with “ the *Bishop* of that Church, while some busy *Presbyters* oppos’d his Authority, &c But I believe no unbiass’d Reader will be able to discover any such Matter. And ’tis to me a strong Presumption there was no such *Bishop*, that when there was so great Occasion to take Notice of him as one highly concern’d in these *Divisions* that are suppos’d to happen in his Church, *Clemens* shou’d pass him over in entire Silence. Had there been then such a *Bishop* in *Corinth*, and particularly such a one as *Silas*, to whose Authority both the *Presbyters* and *People* were subject, What had been more natural than to recommend to him the just Use of his Authority for supporting the Cause of those injur’d *Presbyters*, against a factious *Laity* that wou’d unjustly turn ’em out of their Office? If he sat still as a silent unconcern’d Spectator of those unhappy *Divisions*, without ever interposing his Power to heal them, wou’d not *Clemens* have gently admonish’d him of his Negligence, and urg’d him to exert his *Episcopal Authority* on so just and necessary Occasion? If the *Bishop* us’d his Authority to compose these Differences, but was herein oppos’d either by the *Laity* of *Corinth* or any *Presbyters* that sided with ’em, Wou’d not *Clemens* have admonish’d both the *Laity* and *Clergy* to reverence the Judgment of their *Bishop*, and submit to his *Arbitrement* and *Determination* in these Quarrels? Wou’d he that charges ’em with *Arrogance* in opposing their *Presbyters*, and refusing Subjection to ’em, have taken no Notice of their greater Presumption in opposing the higher Authority of their *Bishop*? Nay, had the *Episcopal See* been then vacant, wou’d not *Clemens* have recommended to ’em the Choice of a *Bishop*, as the best Expedient to heal this woful Division? I must therefore desire Mr. Dr—who so confidently tells me, That *Silas* was at that very Time *Bishop* of *Corinth*, to account for these

strange

strange Omissions of *Clemens*, which no wise Man wou'd have been guilty of, if the Constitution of the Church had been the same then as it was when the Authority of *single Bishops* obtain'd in the Church. And 'till he can give us such a fair Account, I shall take what I have suggested for a strong Argument, that *Corinth* had no such *Bishop* at all. And I find the learned Dr. *Stillington* of the same Opinion, when he tells us, " They that can find any one single Bishop at *Corinth* " when *Clemens* wrote his Epistle to 'em, must have " better Eyes and Judgment then the deservedly admired *Grotius*, &c. *Iren.* p. 279. If he tell me, that *Rome* had such a *Bishop*, viz. *St. Clement* himself, I shall believe it when I see some better Proof of it, than his being call'd so by those that liv'd after a *Congregational* or *Parochial Episcopacy* obtain'd. That he might be a *Senior* among the *Presbyter-Bishops* of that City, and desir'd by this Church to draw up this *Letter* in their Name, I shall not dispute: But if he pretend that he had a Superiority of Order above the *Presbyters* of that Church, I shall believe it when I see it prov'd. And even that it self wou'd not prove him to be any more than a *Parish-Bishop*, whose Authority is so far from being the same with that of a *Diocesan*, that the latter is destructive of the former, (as I shall have Occasion to shew afterwards.) And this leads me to add

5. That from several Passages, it appears every way most probable, That only *single Congregations* were the Ordinary Charge of those *Presbyter-Bishops* that are mention'd in this *Epistle*.

To this Purpose 'tis observable, That *Clemens* tells us, That the *Apostles* constituted *Bishops* and *Deacons* both in the *Cities* and *Countries* where they preach'd, out of the First-Fruits of their Converts. So that wherever a *Church* was gathered, whether in *Cities* (or *Towns*) or in *Regions* and *Country-Villages*, they had their *Bishops* and *Deacons* assign'd 'em. And this is (as I observ'd before) very agreeable to the Scriptural Account of the *Apostle's* Practice, in ordaining *Presbyters* in every  
City

City (or Town) and in every Church. And Clemens farther observes, That the Successors of these Apostolical Bishops were to be set over their Flocks by the Consent of their whole Church [ συνενδοξασις τῆς ἐκκλησίας πᾶσης. ] Which plainly implies, That the Church which they had the Oversight of, was no greater than cou'd meet together and declare such general Consent. But how a *Diocesan Church* consisting of many Scores or Hundred Congregations cou'd meet to signify such Consent, is a Difficulty I must leave Mr. Dr—— to solve at his Leisure. And I hope he will do it better than the *Oxford Editor* of this Epistle has done, who thinks the Practice of the *National Church*, to be conformable to the *Model* of the *Election of Bishops* in the *Primitive Times*: But of this I shall have Occasion to take Notice afterwards.

And thus I have gone thro' this Epistle of Clemens, and must leave the Reader to judge, who they are that (as Mr. Dr.—— speaks) *rely upon forc'd Constructions when they write only for a Party, without consulting the ancient Authors themselves?* Vindic. p. 43. And whether Mr. Dr—— that has insisted so long on this *Fabric*, has prov'd his *Testimony* to be a *flagrant Evidence* against those that deny the *Divine Right* of the *present Episcopacy*? If this Epistle be a *flagrant Evidence* for it, I wou'd be glad to know what he will account a *flagrant Evidence* against it. And I have insisted on it the longer, because I take it to be a *Testimony* of the most clear and unsuspected *Antiquity*, concerning the Practice of the Church immediately after the *Apostle's Decease*. And I fully assent to the Judgment of the learned *Grotius*, who concludes the genuine *Antiquity* of it, for it's not mentioning that *Exorbitant Power of Bishops* (*exortis Authoritatis*) that afterwards prevail'd, but plainly with the *Apostle Paul* shews, That the Churches were govern'd by the *common Council of Presbyters* who were also *Bishops*.



I now proceed to consider Mr. Dr——'s *Second Witness* from Antiquity, viz. Ignatius.

Mr. B. had in the *Postscript* told Mr. Dr——, That when the Distinction between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* first obtain'd, the *Primitive Bishop* was no more for at least a Century or two, or perhaps three, than the *Pastor* of a single Congregation with his *Assistant-Presbyters*, or in some few large Cities, the *Præses* or *Moderator* of a *City-Presbytery*, who (tho' he had some *Superiority of Degree*) did not pretend to any *Superiority of Order or Office* above his *Brethren*.

Mr. B. had produc'd to this Purpose the Judgment of the *Author of Biographia Ecclesiastica*, and that of the *Author of the Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, &c. of the Primitive Church*, who expressly assert, That the *Primitive Bishops* had but one Church or Congregation under their Care: The *Presbyters* being their *Assistants* or *Curates* therein, but of no distinct Order or Office from 'em. Mr. B. had added thereto the Judgment of Mr. Mede and Dr. Burnet (the *Latter* expressly making the *Ignatian Bishop* to have only one *Parish* or one *Church*, with one *Altar* or *Communion-Table* for all under his Charge.

Mr. B. had therefore told him, That if he wou'd draw any Argument for the *Divine Right* of the present *Episcopal Form of Government* from *Antiquity*, he must produce us some solid Evidence from the Two or Three First Centuries of the following Particulars.

1. That the Generality of the *Bishops* of those Ages had each of 'em several Congregations (in each of which all Parts of the ordinary Worship of God, such as Prayer, Praise, Preaching, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper were celebrated) under their Government and Care.

2. That the *Bishops* of those Ages claim'd a Negative Voice in all Acts of Church-Government.

3. That with respect to the highest Censures of the Church, the Sentence of Excommunication was decreed by

by the *Bishop* alone without any *Consent* or *Concurrence* of his *Presbyters*.

4. That the Decreeing this Sentence was ever committed by those *Bishops* to *Civilians* as their *Deligates*.

And I may now add,

5. That the *Primitive Fathers* asserted the *Divine Right* of this *Constitution*.

How little he has prov'd any one of these *Particulars* will appear afterwards.

I shall not enter on the Debate, whether the Seven *Epistles* publish'd by *Vossius* out of the *Florentine Copy* be the genuine Writings of *Ignatius*, or at least *uncorrupt* and free from *Interpolations*. I leave that to those that have more leisure to examine the Arguments alledg'd in so uncertain and dubious a Matter, by *Bishop Pearson* and *Dr. Beveredge* on the one side, and *Daille* and *L'arroque* on the other, and shall only mention one Passage I meet with in the *Nouvelles de Republiq; de Lettres*; Tom. I. Art. V. p. 56, 57. Where the *Author* of the *Elogium* on *Monsieur L'arroque* acquaints us, " That he publish'd a Book in *Latin* to defend the Sentiments of *Mr. Daille* concerning the *Epistles* of *Ignatius*, and the *Apostolick Constitutions*, against *Messieurs Pearson* and *Beveredge* two famous *English Doctors*. They wrote a *Second Time* to defend their Opinion; And he design'd a *Reply*, as may be seen by a Work in Manuscript which was found among his Papers in which he made a great Progress, but at the Desire of several Persons who lean'd too much to the *Episcopal Cause*, he did not finish this *Reply*. So that the best can be said of that Dispute is, *sub judice lis est*. And this Story *Mr. Dr——* may confront with his Story concerning *Blondel* at the End of his Book.

But tho' I have suggested this to abate *Mr. Dr——*'s Confidence, as if it were an incontestable Matter of Fact, that these *Epistles* are genuine, I am so little apprehensive of any Advantage that *Mr. Dr——* can make of 'em in Defence of his Cause, that I am as well

well satisfied as he, that they pass for *genuine*; and hope to make it fully appear that Mr. Dr—— could produce no *Testimony* from Antiquity, that more entirely subverts all Pretences of the present *Diocesan Episcopacy* to a *Divine Right*, since 'tis rais'd on the entire Ruin of the Power that *Ignatius's* Bishops enjoy'd and exercis'd in his Time.

That there was some *Difference* between a *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in *Ignatius's* Time (if those *Epistles* be really his) is a Matter of Fact, that no Man who has read 'em will dispute. But if this *Bishop* was no more than the *Rector* of a *Parish Church* or *Bishop* of a *single Congregation*, and the *Presbyters* under him no more differ'd in *Order* and *Office* from him, than the *Curates* of the *Rector* of a *Parish* do from him, then we may draw two *Inferences* from his *Testimony*, that overturn the whole Design of this *Gentleman's* Book. The First is, That all the *Congregations* of *Protestant Dissenters* have such *Bishops* already as these mention'd by *Ignatius*. The Second is, That *Diocesan Episcopacy* is plainly destructive of the *Rights* which *Ignatius's* *Bishops* were vested in. I know indeed Mr. Dr—— being aware of this, censures it as a *strange Paradox*; and offers a weak *Argument* or two against it, which I shall hereafter meet with. But the *Reader* will better judge of *Ignatius's* *Bishops*, when I have set before him all in those *Epistles* that concerns this Cause.

And that he may pass a more unbiass'd Judgment, I have on either Side of *Ignatius's* *Text* consider'd his Words as they may be differently appli'd to a *Diocesan* or *Parish Bishop*, that the *Reader* may at first View discern whose *Paraphrase* is most natural and unforc'd. And I shall then consider Mr. Dr——'s Reasoning from *Ignatius*, and draw juster *Conclusions* from him.

F

Ignatius



# Ignatius's Epistle to the Church of Ephesus in Asia.

(a) **T**hat being subject to your  
 \*Your Diocesan Bishop and all the Presbyters of the Diocess. \*Bishop and your Presbytery, you may be sanctify'd in all Things. \*Your Pastor and his Presbyters or Assistant Curates.

(b) **F**or Jesus Christ our inseparable Life is the \*Counsel of the Father, as the † Bishops fix'd or dispers'd in the several Parts of the World are in the Counsel of Jesus Christ. † Diocesan Bishops. \*On the Account of the Harmony and Consent of their Wills, as the Pastors of Particular Churches plac'd by him in several Parts of the World are the Council of Christ, or are in his Council, by the Harmony of their Faith. See Dr. Stillingfleet's *Ireni* Part 2. Ch. VI. p. 309.

(c) **I**f I in a short Time have contracted such a Friendship with

(a) ἵνα ἐπιτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, κατὰ πάντα ἡτε ἡγιασμένοι. *Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. Sect. 2.* inter Clerici Patres Apostol. fol. Antwerp. 1698. Vol. 2. pag. 12.

(b) Καὶ ὃ Ἰησοῦς χειρὸς τὸ ἀδιάσπαστον ἡμῶν ζῆν, τὸ παλεῖν ἢ γινώμην, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπισκοποῦσι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρίδοντες ἐν Ἰησοῦ γινώμῃ εἶσιν. *Ibid. Sect. 3.*

(c) Εἰ ὃ ἐγὼ ἐν μικρῷ χρόνῳ τοιαύτην συνίδειαν ἔχω πρὸς τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῶν, ἐκ ἀνθρώπινης ἔσαν ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς μακαρίζω τὰς ἐγκαταριθμίας ὑπὲρ, ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰησοῦ χειρῶ, καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς χειρὸς τῷ παλεῖ, ἵνα πάντα ἐν ἐνότητι συμφωνῶν ἢ ἢ μηδεὶς πλανᾷται· εἰ μὴ πᾶς ἢ ἐν τῷ τῷ δυσπασχεῖν, ὑστερεῖται τῷ ἀρεῖ τῷ Θεῷ. εἰ ὃ ἐνός καὶ δευτέρου πρεσβυτέρου τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει, πόσω μᾶλλον ἡτε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ πάσης ἐκκλησίας; ὁ ἔν μὴ ἐργάμενος ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, ἔτος ἡδὴ ὑπερηφανεῖ, καὶ ἐαυτὸν διέκρινει γέγραπται ὃ ὑπερηφάνοις ὁ Θεὸς ἀντιδρᾷσαι στυγνίσαντες ἐν μὴ ἀντιδρᾷσαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἵνα ὁμῶν δεῖ ὑποτασσόμενοι. *Ibid. Sect. 5.*

your

your Bishop, which is not Humane but Spiritual, how much happier do I account you that are join'd to him, as the Church is to Christ, and Christ to the Father, that all Things may agree in Unity?

\* Let no Man mistake, unless he is within the Altar, (i. e. the Cathedral Altar) he is depriv'd of the Bread of God. For if the Prayer of One or Two have so much Efficacy, how much more the Prayer of the Bishop and the whole Church? He that comes not to the same Place, is puffed up with Pride, and has separated, and judg'd himself. For it is written, God resists the Proud. Let us take Care then not to resist the † Bishop, that we may be subject to God.

\* Let no Man mistake, unless he is within the Altar (by receiving at the Communion Table in your Assembly) he is depriv'd of the Bread of God. For if the Prayer of One or Two have so much Efficacy, how much more the Prayer of the Pastor and the whole Congregation? He that comes not to the Congregation when met together, is puffed up with Pride, and has separated and judg'd himself, &c.

† Bishop of the Diocese.

† Pastor of the Congregation.

\* And the more any in the Diocesan Church shall see the Bishop (of the Diocese) silent, let him reverence him the more, &c.

(d) \* And the more any One shall see the Bishop silent, let him reverence him the more.

\* And the more any (in your Religious Assembly) sees the Pastor of it Silent, let him reverence him the more, &c.

(d) Καὶ ὅσα βλέπει πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, πλείονας αὐτὸν φοβέσθω. πάντα γὰρ ὅν βλέπει ὁ οἰκονομὸς εἰς ἰδίαν οἰκονομίαν, ὥστε δὲ ἡμᾶς αὐτὸν δέχεται, ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν πρῶτον τὸν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὄντα, ὅπως αὐτὸν τὸν κύριον δὲ θεὸν βλέπει. Ibid. Sect. 5.

For whom the Master of the House sends to govern his Family, we ought to receive as him that sent him. 'Tis manifest, that we ought to respect the Bishop as the Lord himself.

\* Let all that belong to the Bishop's Diocess meet often together for Thanksgiving and Praise, for when the whole Diocess meets often together in the same Place, the Strength of Satan is weaken'd.

\* Since every one by Name in the Diocess with common Consent meet together in one Faith, &c. that you may obey your Bishop and all the Presbyters of the Diocess with an undivided Mind, breaking one Sacramental Loaf or Bread (i. e. one Loaf of the same Kind in the several Congregations of the Diocess.)

(e) \* Endeavour to meet often together to give Thanks to God, and to praise him. For when you often meet together in the same Place, the Strength of Satan is weaken'd, &c.

(f) \* Since every one of you by Name with common Consent by Grace, meet together in one Faith and one Jesus Christ, (who according to the Flesh is of the Seed of David, the Son of God) that you may obey your Bishop and the Presbytery with an

\* Let all the Members of the Congregation meet often together for Thanksgiving and Praise, for by your meeting together in the same Place, the Strength of Satan is weaken'd, &c.

\* Since every one of you by Name, with common Consent by Grace, meet together (in the same Assembly) &c. that you may obey your Pastor and his Assistant Presbyters with an undivided Mind, and may there break one Sacramental Loaf, &c. i. e. may all communicate together in the Lord's Supper.

(e) Σπουδαζέτε πυκνότερον συνέρχεσθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δοξάν, ὅτι ἂν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε, καὶ αἰσθάνηται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ Σατανᾶ, κ. τ. λ. Ibid. Sect. 13.

(f) Ὅτι οἱ κατ' ἀνδρα κοινῇ πάντες ἐν χάριτι ἐξ ὀνόματος ὑποτάσσονται, ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, τῷ κατὰ σάρκα ἐν γένει Δαβὶδ, τῷ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ὑμᾶς τῷ ὁπισκώπῳ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτερίῳ, ἀπορίσπασον διανοίαν, ἕνα ἄρτον κλάωτες, ὅς ἐστι φάρμακον ἀθανάσιον, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ πάντος. Ibid. Sect. 20.

undivided



undivided Mind, breaking one Loaf, which is the Medicine of Immortality, an Antidote to preserve us from Dying, and to secure our Living for ever in Jesus Christ.

Epist. 2. To the Church of Magnesia near the Mæander.

(g) SINCE I had the Honour to see you by Damas your \*Bishop, worthy of God, and the worthy Presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and my Fellow-Servant Sotion the Deacon, whom I cou'd wish to enjoy, because he is subject to the †Bishop as to the Grace of God, and to the †Presbytery as to the Law of Christ.

\* By Damas the Bishop of the Diocesis, &c. and the two worthy Presbyters of the Diocesis Bassus and Apollonius, and Sotion the Deacon of the Diocesis, &c.

† The Bishop and the two Presbyters and one Deacon that made up all the Clergy of his Diocesis.

\* By Damas your Pastor and his Assistant-Presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and Sotion the Deacon (of the Congregation at Magnesia,) &c.

† The Pastor of the Congregation, and his two Assistants, and his Deacon.

(g) Ἐπεὶ ἐν ἡξιώσῃν ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς διὰ Δαμά τῷ ἀξιοδέῳ ὑμῶν ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἀξίων Βάσσῳ καὶ Ἀπολλωνίῳ, καὶ τῷ συνδύεμ διακόνῳ Σωτίονος, ἃ ἐγὼ ὀναίμην, ὅσι ὑποτάσσεται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χάριτι θεῷ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.  
Ignat. Epist. ad Magnes. Sect. 2. p. 18.

\* Bishop of the  
Diocess.

\* Pastor of your  
Congregation.

(b) But it becomes you not to be too familiar or saucy with the Age of your \* Bishop, but according to the Power of God the Father, to give him all Reverence, as I know your holy Presbyters do, not regarding the Appearance of his Youthful Ordination, but as wise Men in God yielding to him, but not so much to him, as to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the Bishop of all. For the Honour of him that wou'd have it so, it becomes us to obey without any Hypocrisy, because such a one does not so much deceive the † Bishop that is seen, as mock him that is unseen, &c.

\* Bishop of the  
Diocess, who is seen  
by all in his Diocess.

† Pastor of the Con-  
gregation, who is  
seen by all his Flock.

(b) Καὶ ὑμῖν ὃ πρέπει μὴ συγχρᾶσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ επισκο-  
που, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ πατρὸς πάντων ἐν ἡρώτων αὐτῷ ὑποτάσσασθαι,  
καθὼς ἔγνωσαν καὶ τοὶ ἁγιοὶ πρεσβυτέρους, ὅτι προσελήφοις τὴν φανερὰν  
νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, ἀλλ' ὡς φρονίμως ἐν Θεῷ συγχρᾶσθαι αὐτῷ.  
Οὐκ αὐτῷ ὃ, ἀλλὰ τῷ πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ τῷ πάντων ἐπισκόπῳ. εἰς  
τιμὴν ἣν ἐκείνῳ τῷ δαδύσαντι, ἡμᾶς πρόπον ἐστὶν ὑπακούειν κατὰ  
μυστήριον ὑπόκρισιν· ἐπεὶ ἔχ' ὅτι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῶτον τὸν βλέπομεν  
γονι πλανᾶς, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀόρατον παρολογίζεσθαι. Ibid. Sect. 3.

(i) It

(i) It becomes us not only to be call'd Christians, but to be so. As \* some Name the Bishop indeed, but do all Things without him. Such seem not to have a good Conscience, because they assemble not together in a sure Manner according to the Commandment.

\* Some Name the Bishop of the Diocess but do all without him. Such seem not to have a good Conscience, because their Assemblies are not regular without his appointing 'em.

\* Some Name the Pastor of the Congregation, but do all without him. Such seem not to have a good Conscience, their Meetings or Assemblies not being regular without his Direction.

(k) Since in the Persons I have nam'd, I beheld the whole Multitude † in Faith and Love, I exhort you to make it your Study to do all Things in the Concord of God. The

† That make up the Church of the Diocess.

† That make up your Congregation or Church.

(i) Πρέπον ἔν ἐστίν μὴ μόνον καλεῖσθαι χριστιανὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶναι ὥσπερ καὶ πνεὺς ὁπίσκοπον μὴ καλεῖσθαι, χωρὶς ὃ αὐτῷ πάντα ποιεῖσιν· οἱ τοῖς τοῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐκ συνείδησιν μοι εἶναι φαίνονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ βεβαίως κατ' ἐντολὴν συναθροίσαι. *Ibid.* Sect. 4.

(k) Ἐπεὶ ἔν ἐν τοῖς περιγεγραμμένοις πρεσβυτέροις τὸ πᾶν πληθὺς ἐδιδόξα ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ, ὡς ἐν ὁμοιοῖα Θεοῦ συνεκρίθησαν πάντα ποιεῖσιν, περικαθημένους τῷ ὁπίσκῳ εἰς τόπον διῶ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεκρίθησαν τῶν ὑποκόπων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων, τῶν ἐμοὶ γλυκυτάτων, πεπνευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὅς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρί ἦν, καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη πάντες ἔν ὁμοιοῖαν Θεοῦ λαβόντες, ἐντρέποντες ἀλλήλους, καὶ μηδεὶς κατὰ σάρκα κλεπτέτω τὸ πλησίον, ἀλλ' ἐν Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ ἀλλήλους διαπαντὸς ἀγαπάτω· μηδὲν ἔστω ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ διηθήσεται ὑμᾶς μερίσαι, ἀλλ' ἐνώθητε τῷ ὁπίσκῳ, καὶ τοῖς περικαθημένοις εἰς τόπον [vel τύπον] καὶ διδασκὴν ἀφθαρσίας. *Ibid.* Sect. 6.



\* The Bishop presiding (in the Diocesan Church) in the Place of God, the Presbyters (of the Diocess) in the Place of the Apostolical Senate, and the Deacons (of the Diocess,) &c.

\* Bishop presiding in the Place of God, and the Presbyters in the Place of the Apostolical Senate, and the Deacons most dear to me, to whom the Ministry of Jesus Christ is committed, &c. Having therefore all receiv'd the same God-like Temper, reverence one another; let none regard his Neighbour according to the Flesh, but love one another in Christ. Let nothing divide you, but be united to the † Bishop, and those that preside among you, into the Mould and Doctrine of Incorruption.

\* The Pastor presiding in the Place of God, and the Presbyters (his Assistants) in the Place of the Apostolical Senate, and the Deacons (of the Congregation,) &c.

† The Bishop of the Diocess, and the Clergy thereof.

† Pastor of your Church and those Assistants that preside with him in the Congregation.

(1) As the Lord being united to the Father did nothing without him, neither by himself nor by his Apostles, so neither do

(1) Ὡςπερ ἐν ὁ κύριος ἀνδρὶ τῆ πατρὸς ἐδὲν ἐποίησε, ἡνωμένος  
 ὢν, ἔτε δι' αὐτῆς, ἔτε διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἕως μὴδὲ ὑμεῖς ἀνδρὶ τῆ  
 ὁπισκόπου, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μὴδὲν πρεσβεῖτε μὴδὲ πρεσβύετε  
 εὐλογον π φαίνεσθαι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ μία πρεσβυχή, δέη-  
 σις, εἰς ἓς, μία ἐλπίς ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἀμώμῳ εἰς ὅτι  
 Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς ὁ ἀμείνων ἐδὲν ὄντι πάντες ὡς εἰς ἓνα ναὸν συντρί-  
 χετε διὰ, ὡς ὅτι ἐν δυσπασχείῳ, ὡς ὅτι ἓνα Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν ἀφ'  
 ἐνὸς πατρὸς πηγελθόντα, καὶ εἰς ἓνα ὄντα καὶ χωρῆσαντα. Ibid.  
 Sect. 7. you

Pastor pre:  
the Place of  
the Pres-  
s Assistants)  
ce of the  
Senate,  
Deacons ( of  
regation, )

\* Bishop of the  
Diocesis and his Pres-  
byters.

† But when the whole  
Diocesan Church meet  
together, let there be  
one Prayer, &c.

\* Let all the Dio-  
cesis run together ( to  
the Cathedral Church )  
as to one Temple of  
God, to one ( Cathed-  
ral ) Altar, and to  
one Jesus Christ, &c.

\* Bishop of the  
Diocesis, and well-  
wrought Spiritual  
Crown of the Dioce-  
san Presbytery, and  
Deacons of the Dio-  
cesis.

you any Thing without  
the \* Bishop and his  
Presbyters. Nor en-  
deavour to do any  
Thing that may seem  
reasonable to you apart  
( from them. ) † But  
when you meet toge-  
ther, let there be one  
Prayer, one Depreca-  
tion, one Mind, one  
Hope, in Love and  
blameless Joy. There  
is one Jesus Christ, than  
whom nothing is more  
excellent. \* All there-  
fore run together as to  
one Temple of God, as  
to one Altar, as to one  
Jesus Christ, who pro-  
ceeds from one Father,  
exists in him, and re-  
turns to him.

( m ) With your most  
worthy \* Bishop, and  
well-wrought Spiritual  
Crown of your Presby-  
tery, and Deacons that  
act according to God.  
Be subject to the Bishop  
and to one another.

\* Pastor of the  
Congregation and his  
Assistant-Presbyters.

† But when the  
Congregation meet  
together, let there be  
one Prayer, &c.

\* Let all the Church  
or Consecration run  
together as to one  
Temple of God, one  
Communion - Table,  
( where they all re-  
ceive the Holy Eucha-  
rist together, ) &c.

\* Pastor, and well-  
wrought Spiritual  
Crown of your Pres-  
bytery ( who sit in  
a Circle about your  
Pastor's Seat ) and  
Deacons, ( that take  
Care of the Poor of  
the Congregation. )

( m ) Μετὰ τῆς ἀξιοσπουδαίας ἐπισκόπου ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀξιοπλόκου  
πνευματικῆς στεφάνου τῆς πρεσβυτερίας ὑμῶν, καὶ τῶν κατὰ θεὸν διακό-  
νων ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις. κ. τ. λ. Ibid,  
Sect. 13.

Epist. 3.

of your  
d those Af-  
at preside  
in the Con-

ἡνωμένοι  
ἀνὰ τὴν  
πρεσβυτερίαν  
καὶ τὴν  
ἐκκλησίαν  
ἐν κυρίῳ  
καὶ ἐν  
τῷ  
ἐπισκόπῳ  
καὶ ἀλλήλοις.  
Ibid.  
you

Epist. 3. To the Church in Tralles.

( n ) 'TIS necessary that ( as ye do ) ye act nothing without the \* Bishop. But be also subject to the † Presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, our Hope, in whom let our Conversation be found. The \* Deacons also as the Ministers of Christ, ought by all Means to please all. For they are not Ministers of Meats and Drinks, but Ministers of the Church of God.

\* Bishop of the Diocesi.

† Clergy of the Diocesi.

\* The Deacons of the Diocesi.

\* Let all reverence the Deacons of the Diocesi as the Command of Christ, and the Bishop of the Diocesi as the Figure or Representative of the Father, and the Clergy of the Diocesi as the Council of God, &c. For without these 'tis not called a ( Diocesan ) Church.

\* Pastor of the Congregation.

† Presbyters that assist him in Teaching and Ruling the Congregation.

\* The Deacons of the Congregation, that serve Tables and take care of the Poor of the Church.

\* Let all likewise reverence the Deacons of the Congregation as the Command of Christ, and the Pastor as the Representative of the Father, and the Assistant-Presbyters, as the Council of God, &c. For without these Officers, no Christian Assembly is called a Church.

( n ) 'Αναγκαῖον ἐστίν, ὡς περ ποιεῖτε, ἀνά τῷ ὁπισκοπῷ μηδὲν ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ ὑποτάσσεσθαι καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, ἐν ᾧ διάζοντες εὐρεθῶμεθα· δεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους ὄντας μυστήριον Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, κατὰ πάντα τῶν πάντων ἀρέσκειν· καὶ ὅς βρωμάτων καὶ ποτῶν εἶναι διάκονοι, ἀλλ' ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ ὑπηρεταί. *Ignat. Epist. ad Trall. Sect. 2. pag. 22.*

( ο ) Ὁμοίως πάντες ἐντρέπεσθωσαν τοὺς διακόνους ὡς Ἰησοῦν χριστόν· ὡς καὶ τὸν ὁπισκοπόν, ὅντα ἡδὲ τῷ πατρὶ [ *Notat Cotelierius mendosissimum esse locum, & legendum esse— διακόνους ὡς ἐντολήν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐπισκοπόν ὡς ὄντα πάντων τῷ πατρὶ* ] τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ καὶ ὡς σύνδεσμον ἀποστόλων, χωρὶς τῶν ἐκκλησιᾶς ἐκαλεῖται. *Ibid. Sect. 3.*

Con-



Conjunction of the Apostles. Without these 'tis not call'd a Church.

(p) Keep yourselves from such. Which will be done by you, if you be not puff'd up, but remain undivided from God, Jesus Christ, and the Bishop, and the Precepts of the Apostles.

\* He that is within the Cathedral-Altar is clean, he that is without is not clean.

† He that does any Thing without the Bishop, and Clergy, and Deacons of the Diocese, is not pure in his Conscience.

\* It becomes the whole Diocese, but especially the Clergy of it to refresh their Bishop.

\* He that is within the Altar is clean, he that is without is not clean; that is, † He that does any Thing without the Bishop, the Presbyters, and the Deacons, is not of a pure Conscience.

\* He that is within the Communion-Table of the Congregation, &c.

† He that does any Thing in the Congregation without the Pastor, his Assistant-Presbyters and Deacons, the stated Officers thereof, has not a pure Conscience.

\* It becomes all the Members of the Congregation, but especially the Assistant-Presbyters to refresh their Pastor, &c.

(q) \* It becomes every one of you especially the Presbyters, to refresh the Bishop to the Honour of the Father, Jesus Christ, and the Apostles.

(p) φυλάττετε τοῖς τοιούτοις τὸ τοῦτο ἵνα ὦσιν ὑμεῖς μὴ φουσιμύτοις, καὶ ὦσιν ἀχρεῖς διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τῶν διατάγμάτων τῶν ἀποστόλων· ὁ ὅστις δυσχεραίνει αὐτὸν, καθαρὸς ἔστω τὸ τ' ἐστὶν, ὁ χρεὶς ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτέρου καὶ διακόνου παρόντων, ἕτος ἡ καθαρὸς ἔστω τῇ συνειδήσει. Ibid. Sect. 7.

(q) Πρέπει ὑμῖν τοῖς καθ' ἓνα, ἑξαιρέτως καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, ἀναψύχειν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, εἰς τιμὴν πάσης, Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων. Ibid. Sect. 12.

( r ) Farewel

\* Bishop of the Diocesis, and all the Clergy thereof.

(r) Farewell in Jesus Christ, being subject to the \* Bishop as to the Command of God, and likewise to the Presbytery.

\* Pastor of the Congregation and his Assistant-Presbyters.

Epist. 4. *To the Romans, directed to the Church which is seated in the Place [ Χόρε or Χωρεῖς ] of the Roman Region.*

\* Let all the Congregations in the Diocesis of Rome, remember in their Prayer the Congregations in the Diocesis of Syria;

(f) \* **B**E mindful in your Prayers of the Church which is in Syria, which instead of me, has God for a Pastor. May Jesus Christ alone govern it instead of a Bishop, and your Charity.

\* Be mindful in the Prayers of your Congregation of the Church or Congregation at Antioch in Syria, &c.

Epist. 5. *To the Philadelphians,*

Inscribed

(t) **I**gnatius, &c. to the Church which is at Philadelphia in Asia, &c. whom I sa-

(r) Ἐρρωθεῖ ἐν Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ, ὑποτακόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς τῇ ἐντολῇ, ὁμοίως καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ. *Ibid. Sect. 13.*

(f) Μνημονεύετε ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ ὑμῶν τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας, ἧς ἀντ' ἐμὲ ποιῶσι τὸ Θεῷ χρεῖται μόνος αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς ἐπισκοπῇ, καὶ ὑμῶν ἀγάπῃ. *Ignat. Epist. ad Roman. Sect. 9. p. 30.*

(t) Ἰγνάτιος — ἐκκλησία — τῇ ἐν Φιλαδελφίᾳ τῆς Ἀσίας, — ἣν ἀσπάζομαι ἐν ἀμαρτῇ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ — μάλιστα εἰάν ἐν ἐνὶ ᾧ σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις, κ. τ. λ. *Ignat. Ep. ad Philadelp. in Inscript.*

lute

\* The Bishop of the Diocese, and the Presbyters and Deacons that are with him (i. e. in the same Diocese and subject to his Government as the Bishop of it.)

lute in the Blood of Jesus Christ, &c. especially if they be united with the \* Bishop and the Presbyters and Deacons that are with him, &c.

\* The Pastor and his Assistant-Presbyters, and Deacons that officiate in the same Church or Congregation.

(u) Being Sons of Light and Truth, flee Divisions and false Doctrines; and \* where the Pastor is, there let the Sheep follow.

\* Where the Pastor of the Congregation is, let the Sheep that belong to his Flock follow.

\* Where the Bishop of the Diocese is, let all that belong to his Diocese follow.

(w) Whosoever belong to God and to Jesus Christ, are with the \* Bishop, &c. If any one follow one that makes a † Schism, he shall not obtain the Kingdom of God.

\* The Pastor of the Congregation.

\* Bishop of the Diocese.

† In the Diocesan Church.

† A Schism where by the Congregation is rent and divided.

\* Take care to celebrate the same Eucharist in all the Churches of the Diocese. For there is one Flesh, &c. And one Cathedral-Altar, having many subordinate Parish-Altars, as there is one Diocesan Bishop, one Presbytery of the Diocese, with the Deacons.

(x) \* Take care to use one Eucharist. For there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup for Union in his Blood. And one Altar, as there is one Bi-

\* Join all in celebrating one Eucharist. For there is one Flesh, &c. And one Altar or Communion-Table where the whole Congregation communicates with their one Pastor, and his Assistant-Presbyters and Deacons.

(u) Τέκνα ἐν φωτός, ἀληθείας, φύγετε τὸν μερισμὸν [ καὶ ] κακοδιδασκαλίας· ὅπου ὃ καὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὅστις ἐκεῖ ὡς πρόβατα ἀκολουθεῖτε. Ibid. Sect. 2.

(w) Ὅσοι Θεοῦ εἰσὶν καὶ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ἕτοι μετὰ τοῦ ὁποσδήποτε εἰσὶν. — εἰς ἁγίασμα ἀκολουθεῖ, βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ κληρονομεῖ. Ib. Sect. 3.

(x) Σπειράσεις ἐν μῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι· μία γὰρ σὰρξ τῆς κνέλης ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν πολλῷ ἑνὶ εἰς ἑνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν δυσησθηρίῳ, ὡς εἰς ἐπίσκοπος, ἀμα τὸ πρεσβυτερίον, καὶ διακόνους τοῖς συνδέλοις μῶν. Ibid. Sect. 4.

shop



shop with the Presbytery, and the Deacons my Fellow-Servants.

\* The Bishop, and Presbyters, and Deacons of the Diocess.

† Bishop of the Diocess.

\* The Pastor of the Congregation and his Assistant Presbyters and Deacons.

† The Pastor of the Congregation.

( y ) I cry'd when I was present, I spake with a loud Voice the Voice of God, attend unto the \* Bishop, and the Presbytery and the Deacons. Some suspected me to speak these Things as having a Fore-knowledge of the Division of some. But he is my Witness in whom I am bound, that I know not this by the Flesh, but the Spirit declar'd, saying such Things as these, do nothing without the † Bishop, keep your Flesh as the Temple of God. Love Unity, shun Divisions, &c.

( y ) Ἐπεθύνατε μεταξὺ ὧν, ἐλάλουν μεγάλη φωνή· τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ διακόνοις· οἱ δὲ ὑποκλίσεσθαι μοι, ὡς περὶ πάντα τὸν μερισμὸν πυνων, λέγειν ταῦτα· μάρτυς δὲ μοι ἐν ᾧ δέδεμαι, ὅτι ἀπὸ σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης οὐκ ἔγνων· τὸ δὲ παντοῦμα ἐκήρυσεν λέγων τάδε· χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε τὴν σάρκα ὑμῶν ὡς ναὸν Θεοῦ τηρεῖτε τὴν ἑνωσιν ἀγαπᾶτε, τὰς μερισμὰς φάγετε. Ibid. Sect. 7.

( x ) Where

(x) Where there is Division and Wrath, there God does not dwell; Therefore God forgives all Penitents, if they return to the \*Unity of God, and the Bishops Counsel.

\* To the Unity of God, and the Council of the Diocesan Presbytery, and Diocesan Bishop.

\* To the Unity of God and the Pastor, and his Council of Assistant-Presbyters,

(aa) Because according to your Prayer, and according to the Bowels you have in Christ Jesus, it is told me, That the Church of Antioch in Syria enjoys Peace. It becomes you as \* the Church of God to choose a Deacon, that may there go on a Divine Embassy, that with \* them gather'd together, he may rejoice and glorify the Name (of God.) Blef-

† Of the Diocels.

† You of the Congregation.

\* With the whole Diocels of Antioch consisting of several Congregations assembled together.

\* i. e. With the Christian Congregation at Antioch assembled together.

(x) Οὐ μερισμὸς ὄντι καὶ ὄργη, Θεὸς δὲ κατοικεῖ πάντων ἐν μετανοήσιν. ἀφίει ὁ κύριος, ἐὰν μετανόησωσιν εἰς ἐνότητά Θεοῦ, καὶ συνέδριον τῶ ἐπισκόπου. Ibid. Sect. 8.

(aa) Ἐπεὶ κατὰ τὴν περισυγνὴν ὑμῶν, κατὰ τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ ἔχετε ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπηγγέλη μοι εἰρηνεύειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ Συρίᾳς, πρέπον ὄντι ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ, κατεργασθῆναι διακονοῦν εἰς τὸ πρεσβεῦσαι ἐκεῖ Θεοῦ πρεσβείαν, εἰς τὸ συχαρῆναι αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γρομφόις καὶ δοξάζειν τὸ ὄνομα μακαρίου ἐν Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ ὃς κατεξαιωθήσεται τῆς τριακῆς διακονίας καὶ ὑμεῖς δοξαζήσεσθε δόξασιν ᾗ ὑμῶν ἐκ ὄντος ἀδύνασιν ὑπὲρ ὀνόματος Θεοῦ, ὡς καὶ αἱ ἔγγραφα ἐκκλησίαι ἐπεμψαν ὁπισκόπους, αἱ δὲ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους. Ibid. Sect. 10.

fed





\* Bishop of the Diocess.

\* Bishop. Let that Eucharist be accounted valid which is celebrated in the † Bishops Presence, or with his Allowance. Where the \*\* Bishop appears, Let the Multitude ( Congregation) be. As where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholick Church. †† 'Tis not lawful without the Bishop either to baptize or to make a Love-Feast. But what he approves, that is well-pleasing to God, that whatever is done may be safe and valid.

\* Pastor of the Congregation.

† Pastor's Presence or by his Assistants with his particular Allowance.

\*\* Where the Pastor of the Congregation personally appears, let the Multitude be.

\* 'Tis not lawful without the Pastor of the Congregation, &c.

† Presence of the Bishop of the Diocess, or by a Licence granted to the Presbyters to administer it in their several Parish-Churches.

\*\* Where the Bishop of the Diocess personally appears, let all the People of the Diocess be assembled.

†† 'Tis not lawful without the Bishop of the Diocess to baptize or make a Love-Feast in any of the Parish-Churches within his District, &c.

(cc) 'Tis reasonable that we shou'd repent, and while we have Time turn to God. It will do well to have a respect to God and the \* Bishop. He that honours the Bishop is honour'd of God. He that does a-

\* Bishop of the Diocess.

\* Pastor of the Congregation.

(cc) Ἐυλογον ἐστὶν λοιπὸν ἀνανῆσαι, καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ χειρὸν ἔχοντες, εἰς Θεὸν μετανοεῖν· καλῶς ἔχει, θεὸν καὶ ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι· ὁ πρῶτον ὁπίσκοπον, ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τετίμηται· ὁ δεύτερος ἐπισκόπος τὴν οὐράνιον, τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει. *Ibid.* Sect. 9.

\* Bishop of the Diocess's, &c.

ny thing without the \*Bishop's Privity, does the Devil a Service.

\* Pastor of the Congregation's Privity, &c.

† Bishop and Clergy of the Diocess of Philadelphia.

(dd) I salute the †Bishop worthy of God, and the God-becoming Presbyters, and the Deacons my Fellow-Servants, both singly and all together, &c.

† Pastor of the Church of Philadelphia, and his Assistant Presbyters and Deacons.

\* Families of the Brethren in that Diocess with their Wives and Children, &c.

(ee) I salute the \*Families of my Brethren, with their Wives and Children, Virgins, &c.

\* All the Families belonging to that Congregation, &c.

# Epist. 7. To Polycarp Bishop of the Church of the Smyrneans.

† Widows of the Diocess.

(ff) **L**ET not the \*Widows be neglected, be thou next

† Widows of the Congregation.

(.dd) Ἀσπάζομαι τὸν ἀξιόθιον ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ διοπρεπῆσαιον πρεσβυτέρειον, καὶ τὰς συνδέλφους μου διακόνους, καὶ τὰς κατ' ἀνδρα καὶ κοινῇ πάντας, κ. τ. λ. Ibid. Sect. 12.

(ee) Ἀσπάζομαι τὰς οἰκας τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου σὺν γυναῖξιν καὶ τέκνοις, καὶ τοὺς παρθένας, κ. τ. λ. Ibid. Sect. 13.

(ff) Χήραι μὴ ἀμελεῖσθωσαν μετὰ τὸν κύριον σὺ αὐτῶν φροντισῆς ἕως μηδὲν ἀνδρὶ γνώμης σε γινέσθω μηδὲ σὺ ἀνδρὶ Θεῷ γνώμης πὶ περᾶν, ὅπερ ἐδὲ περᾶν, ἐυσταθῆς πυκνότερον συναγωγὰς γινέσθωσαν ὅς ἐστιν ὀνόματος πάντας ζῆται δέλφους καὶ δέλφους καὶ ὑπερηφάνους ἀλλὰ μηδὲ αὐτοὶ φουσιώσων. Ignat. Epist. ad Polycarp, Sect. 4. pag. 41.

to the Lord, their Guardian. Let nothing be done \* without thy Will. Nor do thou any Thing without the Will of God. † Let your ( religious ) Assemblies be more frequent. Enquire after all by Name. Do not proudly overlook the Men-servants and Maids. And let not them be puffed up.

\* In the whole Diocess.

† Let the Diocessan Church meet often together. Enquire after all by Name ( that b long to the Diocess ) and do not proudly overlook the Men-Servants and Maids.

\* In the Congregation.

† Let the Congregation meet often. Enquire after all by Name ( to see they be present at your religious Assemblies, or be able to give a good Account of their Absence ) Do not ( in Enquiry ) overlook Servants themselves.

\* That belong to thy Diocess.

( gg ) \* Speak to my \* Sisters that they love the Lord, and be content with their Husbands, &c. Command my Brethren, &c. that they love their Wives as the Lord the Church. It becomes Bride-grooms and Brides to marry with the \* Bishop's Advice ( or Consent ) that their Marriage may be according to the Lord, &c.

\* That belong to thy Church or Congregation.

† The Bishop of the Diocess's Advice.

† Pastors of the Congregation's Advice.

( gg ) Ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς μὲν παρακαλεῖ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν κύριον, καὶ τῆς συμβίβου ἀρεσκῶς σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι ὁμοίως καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μὲν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἀγαπᾶν τῆς συμβίβου, ὡς ὁ κύριος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. — παρακαλεῖ δὲ τῆς γαμῶσι καὶ ταῖς γαμυνθήσεσθαι, μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἑνωσιν ποιεῖσθαι· ἵνα ὁ γάμος ᾖ κατὰ θεόν, &c. Ibid. Sect. 5.



\* Bishop of the Diocesis.

† Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons of the Diocesis.

\* Pastor of the Congregation.

† Pastor with his Assistant - Presbyters and Deacons.

(bb) Attend unto the \* Bishop, that God may do so to you. I will pawn my Soul for theirs, that are subject to the \* Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons. And may I have a Part with them in God. Labour, Strive, Run together, Suffer, Sleep, VWake together as the Stewards, Assessors and Ministers of God.

\* Of all the Clergy of thy Diocesan Church.

\* Of the Assistant Presbyters and Deacons of thy Congregation at Smyrna.

(ii) It becomes thee, most Blessed Polycarp, to call together a God-becoming \* Council, and to choose some one that you esteem dear and diligent, who

(bb) Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχεται, ἵνα καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν ἀντιψυχῇ ἐγὼ πάντων ὑποτασσόμεθ' αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέροις, διακόνοις καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν μοι τὸ μέρος γένοιτο χεῖν ἐν Θεῷ. συγκοπᾶτε ἀλλήλοις, συναδελφίζετε, συντρέχετε, συμπάχετε, συγκοιμάδε, συνεγείρετε ὡς Θεοὶ οἰκονόμοι, καὶ πάρεδροι, καὶ ὑπηρεταί. Ibid. Sect. 6.

(ii) Πρέπει, Πολύκαρπε θεομακαριστάτῃς, συμβέλιον ἀγαθὸν γένει θεοπροπέσαι, καὶ χειροτονῆσαι πᾶσι, ὃν ἀγαπῶν λίαν ἔχει καὶ ἀοκνον, ὡς δυνήσεται διόδρομος καλεῖσθαι τῶτον κατὰ ταξιῶσαι, ἵνα πορεύεαι εἰς Σμύρναν, δεξάσθαι ὑμῶν τὴν ἀοκνήν ἀγάπην, εἰς δούξαν χριστὸν κ. τ. λ. Ibid Sect. 7.

may be call'd a *Divine Courier* ( or *Messenger* ) and to put that Honour on him, that he going to *Syria* may commend your diligent Charity for the Glory of Christ, &c.

( *kk* ) Because I cou'd not write to all the \*Churches, because I fail'd in haft from *Troas* to *Neapolis* ( as the [ *Divine* ] VVill commands ) thou wilt write to the †Neighbouring Churches, as one that knowest the Mind of God, that they may do the same. Let those of 'em that can, send *Messengers*. Let others send *Letters* by thy *Messengers*.

\* *Diocesan Church*.

\* *Congregations*.

† *Neighbouring Diocesan Churches*.

† *Neighbouring Congregations*.

( *kk* ) Ἐπεὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐκ ἡδυνήθην γράψαι, διὰ τὸ ἑξαίφνης πλεῖν με ἀπὸ Τρωάδος εἰς Νεάπολιν, ὡς τὸ θέλημα προσάσκει, γράψεις ταῖς ἐμπροσθεν ἐκκλησίαις, ὡς Θεὸς γνώμην κεκτημένος, εἰς τὸ καὶ αὐτὰς τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι· οἱ μὲν δυνάμενοι, περὶς πέμψαι· οἱ δὲ ὀπισθοῦς, διὰ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ πεμπομένων Ibid. Sect. 8.

And thus I have laid before the Reader not a few broken Scraps of *Ignatius*, but all I can find in his *Seven Epistles* that relate to this Cause. ( And I hope Mr. Dr—— who so often perswades me to read 'em, will produce more if he can find any Thing to his Purpose. )

Upon the Review hereof, it will be proper to enquire,

1. What the *Ignatian Bishop* was ? Whether the *Pastor* of a *single Congregation*, that had one *Communion-Table*, and whose Members were capable of ordinary Personal Communion in all the several Parts of Divine Worship, or one that had *several such Congregations* under his Stated Government ?
2. What Difference *Ignatius* makes between these *Presbyters* and the *Bishop* ?
3. What Inferences may be drawn from hence towards clearing the Matter in Dispute ?

For the 1st Query, viz. What the *Ignatian Bishop* was, Whether the *Pastor* of a *single Congregation* that had but one *Communion-Table*, and the Members whereof did ordinarily join in all the several Branches of publick Worship ? Or the *Pastor* and *Ruler* of many *such Congregations* ? I think we may justly conclude, That he was the *former* not the *latter*, for the Two following Reasons.

1. There is no manner of Force offer'd to any Expressions in those Epistles, if we interpret 'em, concerning a *Congregational Bishop* with his *Assistants*, or a *Parish Rector* with his *Curates*. And for this, I appeal to the Passages in *Ignatius* as they are thus interpreted in one of the *Columns* foregoing.

2. There are many Passages in these Epistles, that plainly imply the *Bishop* mention'd by *Ignatius*, to have been no more than the *Pastor* of a *single Congregation*, and that cannot agree to such a *Bishop* as is suppos'd to have several such *Congregations* or *Churches* under his Government.

Thus *Ignatius* saith, [Paragr. c] “ Let no man mi-  
“ stake, unless he is within the Altar, he is depriv'd  
“ of



“ of the Bread of God. For if the Prayer of one or  
 “ two have so much Efficacy, how much more the  
 “ Prayer of the Bishop and the whole Church? He  
 “ that comes not to the same Place is puff'd up with  
 “ Pride, and hath separated and judg'd himself. Now  
 we can very easily understand, how, when every  
 Church has its Altar or Communion-Table, he that  
 comes not to *that*, is *depriv'd of the Bread of God*. We  
 can as readily understand, how a *Parish Bishop* and his  
*whole Church* can join in *one* and the same Prayer; and  
 how justly a Member of that Congregation may be  
 call'd a *Separatist* when he refuses to meet with his  
*Fellow-Members*. But 'tis very hard to understand,  
 why he that is not within the *Cathedral-Altar* shou'd  
 be *depriv'd of the Bread of God*, when he may as well  
 receive it at any *Parish-Altar*. Much less can we under-  
 stand, how the *Bishop* and all the *Churches* of his *Diocese*  
 can offer *one Joint-Prayer* together, or how they can  
 so much as *meet together*; and if they cannot, how a  
 Man shou'd be a *Separatist* for not performing a natural  
 Impossibility?

Again, [Paragr. e.] We can easily imagine, how the  
*Parish-Pastor* and his *Assistants* may *meet often together*,  
 at the same *Place* and *Time* for *Thanksgiving* and *Praise*,  
 and thereby weaken the Devil's Power. But how a  
*Bishop* and all the *Churches* of his *Diocese* shou'd have  
 frequent Assemblies, and that in the *same Place*, and  
 for the *same Religious Services*, is beyond our Under-  
 standings to conceive.

Again [Par. f.] A *Parish Bishop* with his *Assistants*,  
 and every *one of the Congregation by Name* can *meet*  
*together*, and *break one Loaf* or Bread in the Celebra-  
 tion of the same Holy Eucharist: But how a *Bishop* and  
 all his *Clergy* with every *one of their several Congrega-*  
*tions by Name* shou'd *meet* for any such Purpose,  
 Mr. Dr—— will do well to explain.

Again, [Par. g.] Since the Church of *Magnesia* had  
 but *two Presbyters* and *one Deacon* join'd with *Damas*  
 their *Bishop*, we may indeed account very easily for it,

by supposing but *one Congregation* under their Care. But how *two Presbyters* and *one Deacon* shou'd suffice for all the *Congregations* of a small *Diocess*, is beyond our Apprehension.

'Tis very obvious to understand, [Par. i. k.] How all the particular *Meetings* of *one Congregation*, may be particularly ordered and directed by the *Pastor* of it, and what a visible Concord there appears, when the *Pastor* and his *Assistent Presbyters* and *Deacons*, are all present to guide and manage all the Religious Services thereof. But there must be a strange Force put on the Expressions, to apply 'em to the *Bishop* of a *Diocess*, and to his *Clergy*, and the *several Congregations* that belong to the *Diocess*, who have their distinct Assemblies and never meet together at all.

*Ignatius* might very reasonably Charge [Par. l.] the Members of the Church of *Magnesia* to do nothing (in Matters of publick Worship *without or apart from their Pastor and his Assistants*, and recommend to 'em, when they meet together, *one Prayer*, and *one Deprecation*. He might recommend to 'em their running together to *one Temple* and *one Altar* (or *Communion-Table*.) But how a *modern Bishop* shou'd meet together with all the Churches of his *Diocess*, to offer up *one Prayer* and *one Deprecation*; how they shou'd run to *one Temple*, or indeed *one Temple* hold 'em, and *one Communion-Table* serve 'em, is a Difficulty we cannot solve.

We can easily understand *Ignatius's* Mind, when [Par. o.] speaking of a *Pastor* of a *single Congregation* with his *Assistent Presbyters* and *Deacons*, he saith *without these 'tis not properly called a Church*. But we can neither reconcile his Words with *Truth* nor *common Sense*, if he mean, That without a *Diocesan Bishop* that has *many Congregations* under his Government, and *Presbyters* set over 'em, it cannot be called a *Church*. For the Scriptures give the Name of Churches to several *single Congregations* that cou'd have no such *Diocesan Bishop*. The Word *Church* is us'd concerning such particular Assemblies, 1 Cor. xiv. 4. 5, 19, 23, 24 — 4 Col. 16.

14 *Acts* 23. 5 *James* 14. And sure it was but a *single Congregation* that met at *Cenchrea*, 16 *Rom* 1 — or at the *House of Aquila and Priscilla*, 16 *Rom*. 5 — or at the *House of Nymphas*, 4 *Col*. 15. or at the *House of Philemon*, *Philem*. 2 v. Now unless we suppose *Ignatius* ignorant of the common Language and Stile of the Apostolical Writings, he can never be suppos'd to contradict 'em so grossly as to tell us, That we must not give the Appellation of *Church*, to any less than all the *several Congregations* of a *Diocese*, under the Government and Rule of one *Diocesan Bishop* and his *Presbyters*.

The same may be said of [ *Par. p* ] The Application of it to the Members of a *single Congregation*, is natural and easy; but to the Members of a *Diocesan Church*, plainly unnatural and forc'd.

The same may be said of *Par. q*.

'Tis obvious to understand, [ *Par. u* ] how all the *Congregation of Philadelphia* might *be with their Bishop*, and *follow him* as the *Sheep follow their Shepherd*. But how all the *Members of a Diocesan Church* shou'd ordinarily *be with, and follow a Bishop*, whom perhaps they never saw, and rarely can have any personal Acquaintance or Converse with, is a Riddle we must desire *Mr. Dr* — to unfold.

That a *particular Church* may be fitly described [ as *Par. x* ] by such Marks of its *Individuation*, as one *Altar* or *Communion-Table*, and one *Pastor* with his *Assistant-Presbyters* and *Deacons*, is very easy to conceive. But to how miserable Shifts are those reduc'd, that are forc'd to understand this *one Altar*, either of all the *Communion-Tables* in a *Diocese*, because the same Institution is celebrated at every one of 'em, or of one *Cathedral Communion-Table*, that has several *Parish Communion-Tables* subordinate to it? For if the *Bishop* be understood of one *individual Person*, why shou'd not the *one Altar* be understood of one *individual Communion-Table*? And where shall we find in *Ignatius* the least Intimation of any such Distinction between the *Cathedral*



*dral* and the *Parish-Altars*, or the least Intimation, that there were several *Communion-Tables* within the District of *one Bishop*? If there be not the least Syllable to this Purpose in *Ignatius*, but on the contrary, such manifold Proofs (as those I have already recited and shall farther mention,) That the whole Church under the Care of such Bishops as *Ignatius* mentions, did ordinarily *meet together* for all Acts of Worship and Government, we have then all possible Reason to understand his *one Altar* in the most obvious and proper Sense for *one Communion-Table*, at which all the Members of the Church or Congregation did (as *Ignatius* speaks) *break one common Loaf* in the Celebration of that Holy Institution.

Again, [ at Par. aa ] When *Ignatius* advises the Church of *Philadelphia*, to choose a *Deacon* to go to the Church of *Antioch*, he plainly intimates, That when the *Deacon* shou'd come there, he wou'd have Occasion to *rejoice with the whole Church of Antioch gathered together*. There is no Difficulty at all in this, if we suppose that Church a *single* ( tho' perhaps *numerous* ) *Congregation*. But how all the Churches or Congregations of a *Diocese* should assemble together, is not easy to conceive; and on the other Hand, 'tis not very accountable, how all the Churches of a *Diocese* shou'd meet together to choose a *Deacon* to send on that Embassy. And it will sound as odd to understand the *Neighbouring Churches* at the End of that Section of *neighbouring Diocesan Churches*.

Again, [ Par. bb ] When *Ignatius* exhorts the Church of *Smyrna* to follow their *Bishop* and *Presbyters*, and reverence their *Deacons*, and to do nothing belonging to the Church without their *Bishop*. When he allows no *Eucharist* to be valid, but what is celebrated in the *Bishops Presence*, or with his *Allowance*. When he requires the whole *Multitude* (or Church) to attend where the *Bishop* is present (or personally appears.) When he forbids their celebrating *Baptism* or a *Love-Feast* without the *Bishop*; 'tis manifest that he supposes the *Bishop* ordinarily present

sent with the *whole Church* whenever the Sacraments were administered, and that his particular and express Allowance was requisite whenever they were administered in his *occasional Absence*, or administered by a *Presbyter* in his *Presence*. He supposes the *whole Church* or *Assembly* ordinarily capable of *communicating together* with the *Bishop*, and oblig'd to attend his Ministrations. But if we suppose this Church to consist of many *Congregations* that had ordinarily their *distinct Communion*s, that were incapable thro' their Numbers to *meet together*, and that cou'd never *personally assemble together*, with their *Bishop*, we must suppose him to speak downright *Contradictions*, and to require utter *Impossibilities*, and to talk below the rate of common Sense.

So [Par. cc] when he tells us, *That he who does any Thing without the Bishop's Privy does the Devil a Service*, we may easily comprehend the Meaning of it if we understand it of the *Pastor* of the *Congregation*. But it appears down-right ridiculous, if we apply it to the *Bishop* of a *Diocese*, who must have a very hard Task impos'd upon him, as well as the *People* on them, if they must *consult*, and he *advise* them in all their important Affairs, even those relating to their *Souls*, or to their several *Congregations* themselves.

The Salutations [at Par. dd and ee] are very natural and reasonable, if we suppose the *Bishops* and *Presbyters* and *Deacons* ordinarily *present together*, and the *Families* such as belong'd to the same *Congregation*; but look very odd when applied to a *Diocese*, where the *Bishop*, and *Presbyters* and *Deacons* seldom ever *meet together*.

[Par. ff] We may easily understand, how the *Bishop* of *Smyrna* might be the *common Guardian* of all the *Widows* of a particular *Congregation*. He may easily take care to *assemble his Congregation often together*, he may enquire for the *Absent by Name*, even not overlooking the *Men-Servants* and *Maids*. (Tho' even this will be a laborious Task to be performed for a numerous

rous Congregation, and will require the help of his Deacons.) But for the *Bishop* to be the *common Guardian* of all the *Widows* of a *Diocese*; for him to *assemble together* all the *Congregations* of a *Diocese*; for him to enquire for the *Absent by Name*, even the *Men-Servants* and *Maid*s, are such utter *Impossibilities*, that *Ignatius's Charge to Polycarp* on this Supposition appears down-right ridiculous.

And as ridiculous will *Ignatius's Charge* [Par. gg] to the *Members* of the *Church of Smyrna* against *marrying without the Bishop's Advice* (or *Counsel*) appear, if we suppose it a *Diocesan Church* consisting of *many Congregations*. For I presume none will suppose the present Custom of obtaining *Licences* from the *Bishops Court* to have then obtain'd. But his Charge will appear very intelligible and practicable, if we consider the *Bishop* as *Pastor* of a *single Congregation*.

So [Par. ii and kk] what occurs therein, looks very natural and reasonable as applied to particular Congregations, but as unaccountable and strange if apply'd to *Diocesan Churches*.

To sum up the Whole, when there is not the least mention in all these Epistles of more *Congregations* than one under the *Bishop's Care*, when there are so many *Charges* and *Advices* deliver'd, as suppose the *Bishop's whole Church* did ordinarily *meet together*, and had but one *Communion-Table*; when those *Charges* and *Advices* seem at first View so absurd and ridiculous, when apply'd to a *Diocesan Church*, consisting of *several Congregations* with their distinct *Communion-Tables*, when there must be such a perpetual Force and Violence offer'd to his Expressions, if apply'd to a *Diocesan Bishop*, and they carry so plain, so easy, so natural and unstrain'd a Sense, when apply'd to the *Pastor* of a *single Congregation* with his *Assistant-Presbyters* (like the *Curates* of a *Parish-Rector*,) I shall utterly despair of understanding *Ignatius's Meaning*, or of reconciling it with good Sense without understanding him to speak of a *Congregational Bishop*.



II. We must next enquire, What Difference *Ignatius* supposes between this *Bishop* and his *Presbyters*.

That *Ignatius* supposes the *Bishop* to be distinguish'd from 'em, and to have some *Superiority* in managing the Affairs of the Church or Congregation, and supposes the *Presbyters* oblig'd to pay him some Deference and Subjection, I will readily allow him. But the Question is, What kind of *Superiority* his *Bishop* had, and whether it implies any *Distinction* of Office between them; or indeed any greater than is between the *Rector* of a *Parish* and his *Curates*?

Mr. Dr—— when he States the *Distinction* between a *Bishop* and a *Presbyter*, supposes the Powers of *Confirmation*, *Excommunication*, and *Ordination*, to be appropriated to a *Bishop*, and denies 'em to belong to a *Presbyter*. Now I must desire him to review these Epistles of *Ignatius*, and shew us the least Evidence, that he supposes those Powers to be appropriated to the *Bishop*, and excludes the *Presbyters* from all exercise of 'em. On the contrary, the whole Strain of the Epistles shews, That all the Affairs of the *Bishop's Charge*, were manag'd with the common *Authority* and *Consent* both of the *Bishop* and *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. And particularly in the Case of *Polycarp*, he supposes him oblig'd to call the *Presbyters* together in so Minute an Affair, as the choosing a *Messenger* to send to the Church of *Antioch*.

If it be said, That he allows not the *Presbyters* to do any Thing in the Church without the *Bishop's Advice* and *Consent*, not to *Baptize* or celebrate the *Lord's-Supper* or a *Love-Feast*; 'tis true: But I wou'd gladly know what greater *Superiority* he ascribes to him herein, than what the *Rector* of the *Parish* has over his *Assistant-Curates*. For the *Rector* being chiefly intrusted with the Care of the Congregation, does doubtless expect that his *Curates* pay that Deference and Subjection to him, as to do nothing of Importance relating to the Affairs of the Congregation without him, i. e. without his Order or Allowance. The *Curates* never administer the Sacrament of the *Lord's-Supper*, but in his Pre-  
sence

*fence* or with his *Allowance*; nor that of *Baptism*. They never celebrate any other Part of Publick Worship but according to his *Appointment*. So Mr. Dr—— and Mr. I——n are with respect to Dr. T——r's (whose *Curates* they are) in as much *Subjection* as *Ignatius's Presbyters* were to his *Bishop*, (as much as *Apollonius* and *Bassus* for Instance were to *Bishop Damas.*) Nay in some Respects, the *Curates* are more dependent on the *Rector* of the *Parish*, who can at his Pleasure dismiss 'em from the Exercise of their Office in his *Parish-Church*, which is more than I can find, that *Ignatius's Bishop* was impower'd to do. And I do not find, that the *Rector* of the *Parish* is under such strict Obligations to consult with his *Curates*, and with the *Overseers of the Poor* in all the Affairs of his *Parish-Church*, as *Ignatius's Bishop* was to consult with the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. And yet I presume, that notwithstanding all this *Superiority*, Mr. Dr—— and Mr. J——n think themselves to be of the same Office and Order with Dr. Tr——rs whose *Curates* they are, and do not imagine that his *Superiority* in managing the Affairs of the Congregation, does infer any *intrinsic Spiritual Power* beyond what they are vested with; but only that the Care of the *Parish-Church* is principally committed to him; and that 'tis their Work to give him their *Assistance* therein as he shall appoint and direct. So that we may easily account for all the Preheminence or Superiority that *Ignatius* ascribes to his *Bishop* above the *Presbyters*, without supposing any Distinction of Office or Order between 'em; or ascribing any *Spiritual Powers* to his *Bishop*, that his *Presbyters* were never vested in.

Before I proceed to draw such Inferences from hence as may clear the Matter in Dispute, I shall consider what Mr. Dr—— objects against our making *Ignatius's Bishop*, only such a *Parish-Rector* with the *Presbyters* as his *Assistant-Curates*.

He tells us, " This is the greatest *Paradox* in Nature, and that they who can thus implicitly believe " against Matter of Fact and expreis Words, are very well

" well qualify'd to believe the absurdest Doctrines of  
 " Popish Jesuits and Priests.

*Answ.* What this Gentleman calls the *greatest Paradox in Nature*, will I presume on the Review of what I have offer'd, appear to all unbiaſ'd Readers *plain Matter of Fact* grounded on the expreſs Words of *Ignatius*, without any manner of Violence offer'd to 'em. Whereas thoſe that ſuppoſe *Ignatius* to ſpeak of a *Diocesan Biſhop*, having *many Congregations* with their *diſtinct Rectors* and *diſtinct Communion-Tables* under him, muſt (as I have ſhewn) put ſuch a perpetual Force on that *Father's* Expreſſions, and muſt ſuppoſe him to require ſo many *impoſſible Things*, and talk at ſo abſurd a Rate, that to return *Mr. Dr* — his civil Complement, *Thoſe that can believe this, are well qualify'd to believe the abuſed Doctrines of Popery, Tranſubſtantiation it ſelf not excepted.* For that modern *Biſhop's* Body and Soul too, muſt exiſt in ſome *Scores or Hundreds* of Places at once, that can as frequently meet with his *whole Dioceſs*, and as often by Name enquire for every *Absentee*, pray with 'em, and adminiſter the Sacrament to 'em together, as *Ignatius* ſuppoſes the *Primitive Biſhop* oblig'd to do.

*Mr. Dr* — argues from this *Father's* likening the *Biſhop* to *God and Chriſt*, and diſtinguiſhing him from the *Presbyters*.

*Anſw.* For *Ignatius's* diſtinguiſhing the *Biſhop* from the *Presbyters*, it has been already accounted for. But I wou'd deſire *Mr. Dr* — not to lay any great Streſs on his likening the *Biſhop* to *God and Chriſt*; for if he call the *Biſhop* the *Grace* (or *Gift*) of *God*, he calls the *Presbytery*, the *Law of Chriſt*. [ *Par. g* ] Nay he compares the *Church* as diſtinguiſh'd from their *Biſhop* and *Presbyters* to *Chriſt*, and the *Biſhop* and *Presbyters* to *God* himſelf, and makes *Chriſt's* Subjection to the *Father*, a *Pattern* of their Subjection to them. [ *Par. l* ] He calls the *Presbyters* themſelves the *Council of God*. [ *Par. o* ] And thus *Polycarp* in his *Epistle* to the *Church at Philippi* exhorts 'em to be ſubject to the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, as to *God and Chriſt*,  
 Where



Where he puts the *Presbyters* in the Place of *God*, and the *Deacons* in the Place of *Christ*. And to speak the Truth, tho' I think as highly as any can do of the Piety and Zeal of *Ignatius*, yet I am far from thinking him accurate or cautious in his Expressions. For unless we give him some considerable Grains of Allowance, for what a late Author terms his turgid *Asiatick* Style, it will be hard to excuse many of his Expressions from great *Absurdity* and *Blasphemy* it self. For let M. Dr—— apply all *Ignatius's* Expressions either to every *Rector* of a *Parish-Church* or every *Bishop* of a *Diocese* thro' the Christian World, and if every such *Parish* or *Diocesan Church* must pay the like blind Subjection to their *Rector*, or their *Diocesan Bishop* as *Ignatius's* unguarded Expressions require, they must in a great Part of the Christian Church comply with many idolatrous and superstitious Practices, that have crept into their publick Worship, and are kept up there by the Authority of the *Diocesans* and *Parish-Priests* for the Advancement of their secular Interest. Now shou'd such *Diocesans* or *Parish-Rectors* urge upon all under their Government, such a Charge as that of *Ignatius*, "That  
 " they must not resist their Bishop, that they may be  
 " subject to God; that they ought to respect the Bishop  
 " as the Lord himself; that they must do nothing  
 " without the Bishop, even though it seems reasonable to themselves; that they must be subject to  
 " the Bishop as the Command of God; That all who  
 " belong to God and Christ are with the *Bishop*, and  
 " none that separate from him shall inherit the Kingdom of God; that they must follow the Bishop as  
 " Christ the Father; that what the Bishop approves is  
 " well-pleasing to God; and that *Ignatius* offers to  
 " pawn his Soul for those that are subject to their *Bishop*, &c. I say, shou'd all *Diocesan Bishops* or *Parish-Rectors*, urge all these and the like Advices of *Ignatius* on all in their *Parishes* or *Diocesses*, What wild Work wou'd this make? Alas! how wou'd perhaps the greatest Part of the People in the Christian World,  
 find

find some of the Commands of their *Bishops* or *Parish-Rectors* inconsistent with the Commands of God, and that they cannot obey such *Bishops* without disobeying him! So that we must either think all the Laity thro' the Christian World oblig'd to implicate Faith, and blind Obedience, or own that *Ignatius's* Expressions are often very unwary, and such as require a very large Allowance to render 'em consistent with Truth. For he seems to take it for granted, that all *Bishops* were not only *Orthodox* in the Faith, but just in all their *Injunctions*, and regular in all their *Administrations*, never once imposing on their People *humane Traditions* for *divine Precepts*. And therefore puts in no *Caveat*, no *Reservation* for such Cases, wherein such *Bishops* themselves swerve in their *Doctrine*, or *Injunctions* from the *Instructions* of their great Lord and Master. We must not therefore stretch every such Expression in *Ignatius*, beyond what may be reasonably suppos'd his true Intent and Meaning. I shall conclude my Answer to this Argument, with that remarkable Passage in Dr. *Stillingfleet's Irenicum*, where taking Notice of that Passage of *Ignatius* in his Epistle to the Church of *Magnesia*, wherein he commends *Sotion* for being subject to the *Bishop* as the *Grace of God*, and the *Presbytery* as the *Law of Christ*; he saith, *Irenic. pag. 308, &c.* " It might be no improbable Conjecture to guess from hence, at *Ignatius* his Opinion concerning the Original both of *Episcopacy* and *Presbytery*. The former he looks on as an excellent Gift of God to the Church; so a learned Doctor paraphraseth *Gratia Dei*, i. e. *Dono a Deo Ecclesie indulto*; so *Cyprian* often (*Divina Dignatione*) speaking of *Bishops*, i. e. that they looked on it as an Act of God's special Favour to the Church, to find out that Means for Unity in the Church, to pitch upon one among the *Presbyters* who shou'd have the chief Rule in every particular Church; but then for *Presbytery*, he looks on that as *Νόμος Ιησού Χριστού*, an Institution and Law of *Jesus Christ*, which must on that Account

H

" always

“ always continue in the Church. And so *Sotion* did  
 “ commendably in submitting to the *Bishop*, as a Fa-  
 “ vour of God to the Church for preventing *Schisms*,  
 “ on which Account it is, and not upon the Account  
 “ of *divine Institution*, that *Ignatius* is so earnest in re-  
 “ quiring Obedience to the *Bishop*, because as *Cyprian*  
 “ saith *Ecclesia est plebs Episcopo coadunata, & grex Pa-*  
 “ *stori adhaerens*; and the *Bishops* then being *Orthodox*,  
 “ he lays such a Charge upon the People to adhere to  
 “ them, (for it is to the People, and not to the *Presby-*  
 “ *ters* he speaks most) which was as much as to bid  
 “ them hold to the Unity of the Faith, and avoid  
 “ those pernicious Heresies which were then abroad;  
 “ and so *Ignatius* and *Jerome* may easily be reconcil’d  
 “ to one another; both owning the Council of *Presby-*  
 “ *ters* as of *divine Institution*, and both requiring Obe-  
 “ dience to *Bishops*, as a singular Priviledge granted to  
 “ the Church for preventing *Schisms*, and preserving  
 “ Unity in the Faith. And in all those Thirty five  
 “ Testimonies produc’d out of *Ignatius* his Epistles for  
 “ *Episcopacy*, I can meet but with one, which is  
 “ brought to prove the least semblance of an *Institu-*  
 “ *tution of Christ* for *Episcopacy*, and if I be not much  
 “ deceived, the Sense of that Place is clearly mistaken  
 “ too. The Place is *Ep. ad Ephesios*, he is exhorting  
 “ the *Ephesians* συντέλειν τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ, which I sup-  
 “ pose may be rendred, to fulfil the Will of God, so  
 “ ποιῆσαι ἢ γνώμην, signifies *Apocalyps*, 17. 17. and adds,  
 “ καὶ ὁ, Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς τὸ ἀδιακρίστον ἡμῶν ζῆν, τὸ πάτριος ἐν γνώμῃ,  
 “ ὡς καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ κατὰ τὰ πνεύματα ὁριζήσιν· ἐν Ἰησοῦ γνώμῃ  
 “ εἶσιν· ὁθεν πρέπου ὑμῶν συντέλειν τῇ τῷ ὀφθαλμοῦ γνώμῃ, ὅπως καὶ  
 “ ποιεῖτε. He begins to exhort ’em to concur with the  
 “ Will of God, and concludes his Exhortation, to con-  
 “ cur with the Will or Council of the Bishop, and in the  
 “ Middle, he shews the Ground of the Connexion  
 “ of these two together; for *Christ* (saith he) who is our  
 “ inseparable Life, is the Counsel of the Father; and  
 “ the Bishops who are scattered abroad to the Ends of  
 “ the Earth, are the Counsel of *Jesus Christ*, i. e. do  
 “ concur



" concur with the Will of Christ; therefore follow the  
 " Counsel of your Bishop, which also you do. Every  
 " Thing is plain and obvious in the Sense here, and  
 " very coherent to the Expressions both before and af-  
 " ter, only the *et* must be left out as plainly redun-  
 " dant, and *et* *deservet* must not be render'd *determinati*,  
 " but rather *determinati*, because it refers to a Place  
 " here, and so it notes their being dispers'd into sever-  
 " al Places, and separated from one another; there-  
 " by implying the Unity of their Faith, and the *coa-*  
 " *gulum fidei*, notwithstanding their Distance from one  
 " another as to Place in the World, which in Cyprian's  
 " Words is, *Ecclesia universa per totum mundum unita-*  
 " *tis vinculo copulata*. And certainly a stronger Argu-  
 " ment than this cou'd not have been given for the  
 " *Ephefians* chearful Obedience to their Bishop (which  
 " is the Thing he aims at) than the universal  
 " Consent of all the Bishops in the Christian World in  
 " the Unity of the Faith of Christ; so that as Christ  
 " is the Will and Counsel of the Father, because of  
 " that Harmony and Consent which is between their  
 " Wills; so the Bishops are the Will and Counsel of  
 " Christ, as chearfully uniting in the Profession of  
 " his Faith. So that we see *Ignatius* himself cannot  
 " give a doubting Mind satisfaction of the *Divine In-*  
 " *stitution* of Bishops, when in the only Place brought  
 " to that Purpose, his Sense is quite different from  
 " what it is brought for.

Only here I must add, 'Tis only *Congregational Epif-*  
*copacy* that *Ignatius* speaks of. And shou'd that be al-  
 low'd to have any *Divine Institution* in the Judgment of  
*Ignatius*, it wou'd not prove but overturn any Preten-  
 sion of a *Divine Right* for *Diocesan Episcopacy*. For  
*Ignatius* is far from supposing that his *Congregational*  
*Bishops* throughout a whole Province, are by *Divine*  
*Right* subjected to a *Diocesan one*.

But Mr. Dr—— in Opposition to Mr. B's Plea,  
 That the Extent of a Church in *Ignatius's* Days, reach'd  
 not beyond *Personal Communion*, so that every Church was

no more than a single *Parish* or *Congregation*, in which all the Members of the Church might meet together, saith,  
 “ I must observe to this Gentleman, That the State  
 “ of the Church, as *Ignatius* describes it in all his *Epi-*  
 “ stles, is a *Bishop*, a *Company* or *Colledge* of *Presbyters*,  
 “ and another of *Deacons*; so that to say, That the  
 “ Church was no more than a single *Congregation*, is  
 “ to suppose the Apostles to have provided a super-  
 “ fluous Company of Officers for so small a Number  
 “ of Believers, when one wou’d have done as well.  
 “ And when Mr. B. desires a *Bishop* according to *Ignatius’s*  
 “ Model in every *Parish*, his Request is as unrea-  
 “ sonable, as if he shou’d Petition, That every single  
 “ *Congregation* shou’d have a *Bishop*, a *Company* of  
 “ *Presbyters*, and another of *Deacons* to support and  
 “ maintain. For this must have been the State of the  
 “ Church in this Martyr’s Time, if the Word Church  
 “ according to Mr. B. extended no farther than to a  
 “ particular *Congregation*.

*Answ.* I think it is a weak way of Reasoning to argue against plain *Matter of Fact*, from pretended *Inconveniencies*, and yet I take this to be the Case here. I grant every Church or *Congregation* in *Ignatius’s* Time, had usually a *Bishop* or *Pastor*, and some *Presbyters* as his *Assistants*, and one or usually more *Deacons* to serve Tables. But saith Mr. Dr. — “ This sup-  
 “ poses the Apostles to have provided for every *Congregation*, a superfluous Number of Officers, when  
 “ one wou’d have serv’d as well. The Question then will be, Whether the Apostles did ordinarily provide more than one under the Character of *Bishop* or *Presbyter* for every *Congregation* they planted? And I think the Matter of Fact here can hardly admit of any reasonable Dispute. For we read of the Apostles constituting or ordaining Elders [κατ’ ἐκκλησίας] in every Church. And Titus in Crete, is requir’d to ordain Elders (who are call’d also *Bishops*) in every City or Town [κατὰ πόλιν.] And accordingly we find both *Bishops* and *Deacons* in the Church of *Philippi*. And so we find

*Presbyter*

*Presbyter-Bishops* in the Church of *Ephesus*. And when the sick Person in *St. James* is exhorted to send for the *Presbyters of the Church*, v *James* 14. we cannot reasonably suppose that he means the *Presbyters* of several *Neighbouring Churches* that made up the *Diocesan Church*, but those of the particular Church or Congregation which the sick Person is a Member of. And where they constituted *Elders* or *Bishops* in a Church, they appointed *Deacons* too, that while the former gave themselves to the Word and Prayer, the latter might perform that lower Work of serving Tables, vi *Acts* 1, 2, 3. And yet the *Apostles* did by no Means think such a Number of Officers in every Congregation any way superfluous, especially in that Age when they had so many Infidels round about 'em to endeavour the Conversion of. And there was the like Necessity of many such Officers in every Congregation in *Ignatius's* Time, so that Mr. Dr——'s *Objection* carries a tacit Reflexion on the Wisdom of the *Apostles*, and charges what was their undoubted Practice with Absurdity and Folly.

And for the other Difficulty he starts, viz. "How a Bishop, a Company of *Presbyters*, and another of *Deacons*, shou'd be maintain'd by every Congregation, he might think it a very insuperable one indeed, if every *Bishop* was to have the Revenue of a modern *Diocess* assign'd him, or every *Presbyter* as much as our *Parish-Rectors* generally enjoy, &c. But if it appear in Fact, That the Plurality of such Officers in every Church or Congregation, had as much Maintenance and Support from the voluntary Offerings made by the People as they needed, and did satisfy and content 'em, then I hope this *Objection* will not only appear to have no Force in it, but even this Matter of Fact will appear to be a considerable Evidence, that the Extent of a *Bishop's* Church in *Ignatius's* Time reach'd not beyond personal Communion, and that the Members of it did ordinarily assemble together for all the Parts of Publick Worship.



To clear this Difficulty by truly stating the Matter of Fact.

1. It must be observ'd, That many then officiated in the Church, who neither *needed* nor *receiv'd* any *Maintenance* at all from it.

Thus by the 40th *Apostolical Canon*, Tho' the Goods and Money belonging to the Church were chiefly intrusted to the *Bishop*, yet he was not to apply any of 'em to his own Use, except he stood in need of 'em and cou'd not otherwise subsist. We may see the same Order given by the 25th *Canon* of the *Council of Antioch*. And therefore *Chrysostome* tells us, That in Elections, those often carried it who had Estates of their own, because the Church wou'd not then need to be at the Charge of maintaining them, *De Sacerd. Serm. 3. tom. 6. p. 23.* And *St. Ambrose* will allow none of the Clergy a Stipend that had other Revenues of their own. *Off. Lib. I. c. 36.*

2. It may be farther observ'd, That Clergymen were then allowed any honest way of getting their Livelihood, that might render 'em less chargeable to the Church they belong'd to.

Even *Bishops*, and *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* were allow'd to Traffick for their Livelihood, by the 18th *Canon* of the *Council of Elvira*, and were only confin'd to Traffick *within their own Province*. And the Fourth *Council of Carthage* order'd, That the Clergy tho' learn'd in the Word of God, shou'd get their Living by a Trade. See *Can. 23d.* And by the next *Canon*, they are allow'd to get it either by a Trade or by Husbandry, with a *Proviso*, that it be not a Prejudice to their Office, (*i. e.* such a Trade as wou'd take up most of their Time.) And the Clergy were no otherwise restrain'd herein by the 15th *Canon* of the 3d *Council of Carthage*, than that they shou'd forbear such Trades as were *sordid* or *dishonest*.

3. Great Frugality and Parsimony in their Expences was then enjoin'd.

Thus

Thus the 4th Council of *Carthage* enjoins, That the *Bishop* shou'd have a *small House* (*Hospitolum*) not far from the Church, That he shou'd have *cheap Furniture* and a *homely Table* and *Food*.

Now where some of the Clergy were thus subsisted either out of their own Estates, or by their own *Industry*, and where so much *Parsony* was requir'd in all of 'em, even in the *Bishops* themselves, who were not allow'd to bestow any of the Churches Goods on their own *Domesticks* or nearest Relations, and who were not to dispose of 'em without the Consent of their *Presbyters* and *Deacons*; there the Profits or Revenues of an ordinary *Parish-Church*, wou'd be sufficient for furnishing the *Rector*, and *Curates*, and *Overseers of the Poor*, &c. with all the Maintenance they then thought needful.

4. It actually appears, That particular Congregations had then such a Number of Officers.

We may to this Purpose observe, That *Collections* were made (pursuant to the *Apostles* Orders to the Churches of *Galaria*, and doubtless to all others) on every *Lord's-Day*, 1 Cor. XVI. 1, 2—These *Collections* were at first to be receiv'd and dispos'd of by the *Deacons* of the Congregation. For to them the *Apostles* referr'd the Disposal of such charitable Contributions, while they gave themselves to the Word and Prayer—VI *Acts* 1, 2, 3, 4. And they doubtless design'd that all succeeding *Pastors* shou'd do so too. These voluntary Contributions were at first such *First-Fruits*, *Tythes*, or other *Offerings*, as were brought by the Faithful on every *Lord's-Days*, and at first laid on the Altar or Communion-Table. And these were employed for what Maintenance was needful for such as officiated in the Congregation, as the *Pastor* and his *Assistant-Presbyters*, &c. for the support of the *Fabrick* of the Church, for the Relief of the Poor. The *Bishop* or *Pastor* and his *Assistant-Presbyters* then usually liv'd in common, dwelt often in the same House, and were maintain'd out of the same *Offerings* at the Communion-Table. See to this Purpose *Father Paul Sarpi's Tract of Church-*

*Benefices, I. II, III Art. And Tolet. de Sacerdot. Lib. 5. c. 4. n. 15. p. 722.* In the Primitive Church (saith he) "till the Times of *Austin* and *Jerome*, the *Bishop* and "Clergy were wont to live in common, whence the "Goods that were offered either of Tythes or other Gifts "of the Devotion of the Faithful were undivided, and "subjected to the Distribution of the *Bishop* [In this particular, they soon swerv'd from the *Apostle's* Order of referring that Matter wholly to the *Deacons*.] "And they were bestow'd partly on the *Bishop*, partly "on the *Clergy*, partly on the *Fabrick of the Church*, and "partly on the *Poor*. And that these were the Contributions of each particular Church or Congregation, is evident from that noted Testimony of *Justin Martyr*, "On the "Lords-Day, (saith he) those out of the City (or "Town) and the Country assemble together, where "the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles are read "as much as is needful. The Reader ceasing, the *Præpositus*, (the *Bishop* or *Pastor*) makes an Exhortation, — Then all rise and offer their Prayers. "Which being ended, there is brought forth Bread, "Wine, and Water. Then the *Præpositus* (the *Bishop* or *Pastor*) according to his Ability offers Prayers "and Thanksgivings, and the People say *Amen*. Then "the consecrated Elements are distributed to every "one, and sent to those that are absent by the *Deacons*. The *Rich* make voluntary Contributions. The "Collection is put into the Hand of the *Præpositus* (the "Bishop or *Pastor*) He relieves the Orphans, Widows, "the Sick and Indigent, Prisoners and Strangers, and "in short takes Care of all the *Poor*. And all *Antiquaries* agree, that the *Bishop* and *Presbyters* were themselves maintain'd out of the same common Stock, the *Poor* being allow'd in some Churches a *Third*, in others a *Fourth* Part of it. To the like Purpose we may observe from the *Apostolical Constitutions*, That all the *Revenues* of the Church, whether *First-Fruits*, *Tythes* or other voluntary Oblations were brought to the *Bishop*. And the Reason given is, "For he well knows all



“ all that are in Affliction or want, and gives to every  
 “ one what is convenient. Lest some shou’d in the same  
 “ Day or the same Week receive twice or oftner, and o-  
 “ thers nothing at all. And we may easily judge,  
 how large the Bishop’s Church was, when he was so  
 particularly acquainted with all the Poor that belong’d  
 to it. See *Const. Apost. L. 2. c. 27.* Nay in their  
*Love-Feasts*, the Bishop was to have his Part if *present*,  
 or if *absent*, it was to be sent Home to him. And  
 how that shou’d be practicable in a modern Diocess, let  
 Mr. Dr—— judge.

And I may here add, That ’tis observable, that  
 as *Congregations* were more or less numerous and rich,  
 so they had usually a greater Number of *Officers*.  
 Thus the Church of *Magnesia* in *Ignatius*, that was prob-  
 ably a much smaller one than that of *Ephesus*, *Phi-*  
*ladelphia*, &c. had but two *Presbyters* and one *Dea-*  
*con*: Whereas the others seem to have had more. But  
 the Charity of most of ’em was so great, as not only to  
 give their own *Officers* as much Maintenance as satisfied  
 ’em, but many *Richer* Congregations contributed to the  
 Relief and Support of such as were *Poorer*. So that what  
 Mr. Dr—— vainly imagines to be an insuperable Dif-  
 ficulty, was none at all in those early Ages of *Chri-*  
*stianity*, in which as the Charity of the Faithful was  
 far greater, so the Clergy were contented with a very  
 moderate Allowance, suited to their humble and tem-  
 perate way of Living, before *Ambition*, and *Avarice*  
 and *Luxury* had corrupted ’em. And tho’ in the present  
 State of the Christian Church, this may at first View  
 appear a greater Difficulty; yet were there a more  
 equal Distribution made of the *Goods* of the Church,  
 and the *Simplicity* and *Parsimony* of the *Primitive Age*  
 reviv’d, perhaps much of this Difficulty wou’d vanish;  
 and every *Parish* might be furnish’d with its *Bishop* and  
*Assistants* and *Deacons* as well as the *Primitive Churches*  
 were. But the seeming *Difficulty* it self can be no material  
 Objection against plain *Matter of Fact*. Besides there  
 may not be the same *Necessity* now for so many *Officers*  
 in

in each *Congregation* as there was in the first Ages, when so many Infidels round about 'em were to be converted; and when every *Church* was to be a kind of *Seminary*, to train up such as might either succeed in the Place of its deceased Pastors, or might take care of other Churches, when the increase of Converts might give the happy Occasion of erecting them. For the Christians had not then (as they have now) publick *Seminaries* of Learning to train up Persons for the Ministry. But still even now where Churches are numerous and able, 'tis highly expedient they should have more *Pastors* or *Teachers* than one, to take the more effectual Care of 'em, in order to their greater Edification, and *Deacons* to take care of the Poor. And this was the general Practice of the Reformed Churches of France.

I proceed,

III. To consider, VVhat genuine Inferences may be drawn from this Testimony of *Ignatius* towards clearing the Matter in debate.

I. Mr. Dr—— may hence see, That we are so far from opposing such a *Bishop* as *Ignatius* intends, that every Dissenting Congregation has such a *Bishop* fix'd in it. Every such Congregation has a *Pastor* that performs all the Offices with respect to his Congregation, that *Ignatius's* Bishop is requir'd by him to perform towards his, and is as much vested with the Powers of *Excommunication* and *Ordination* as the *Ignatian* Bishop was. Every such Pastor has his *Altar* or *Communion-Table*, where all the Members of his Church meet to partake of the same Eucharist. Every such Pastor ordinarily prays with, instructs his Flock, and is their Guide in all the Parts of Publick VVorship. In a VVord, Let Mr. Dr—— produce any one Act of Pastoral Authority respecting his Flock, that is prescrib'd to the *Bishops* of *Ephesus*, *Magnesia*, &c. by *Ignatius*, that our *Pastors* do not perform to their *Congregations*.

If Mr. Dr—— alledge, That the Pastors of Dissent-

ing

ing Congregations have not such *Subject-Presbyters* as *Ignatius* mentions; 'tis easily answer'd, that 'tis not necessary to such a *Primitive Bishop* that he have *Presbyters* under him, as *Mr. Dr.* himself owns, *Vindic. p. 41* — And as several Examples from *Primitive Antiquity* demonstrate; no more than 'tis necessary for every *Rector* of a *Parish* to have *Curates* under him. His wanting or not wanting such *Assistants* depends much on his own *Abilities*, and the *Numbers* of his *Flock* or *Charge*. And I may add, That where the *Dissenting Congregations* are *numerous*, the *Pastor* has usually a *Colleague* or *Coadjutor* (one or more.) If it be again said, that such *Colleagues* are not of a different *Order* or *Office* from the *Pastor*; 'tis replied, that neither were *Ignatius's Presbyters* of a different *Order* from their *Bishop*. If it be farther said, that *Ignatius's Bishop* had some *Superiority* over his *Presbyters*; 'tis again reply'd, that where there is a considerable *Difference* in *Point* of *Age* or *Abilities*, there is the like *Deference* due from a *less learned* or *Junior Assistant* to his more *learned* or *Elder-Colleague*, on whom the chief *Care* of the *Congregation* is devolv'd. Nay, shou'd we suppose the *Presbyters* in *Ignatius's Time* to be an *Order* inferior to the *Bishop*, (which I am confident no *Man* will be able to prove from the *Epistles* of *Ignatius*;) yet this wou'd only prove, that we reject this *Order* of *Ignatius's inferior Presbyters*, but by no Means that we reject his *Order* of *Bishops*. And indeed we can see no *VVarrant* for any such *inferior Order* of *Presbyters* from the *New-Testament*. All the *Presbyters* of *Ephesus*, *Philippi*, and the *Towns* in *Greece* being *Bishops*. And so were all those *Pastors* that *Clemens* tells us, the *Apostles* constituted in *Cities* and *Countries* out of the *First-Fruits* of their *Converts*, truly *Bishops*. And such *Bishops* were those *Presbyters* of *Corinth*, whom *Clemens* blames the factious Part of that Church for turning out of their *Episcopal Office*. So that were *Ignatius's Presbyters* of a distinct *Order*, we may be charg'd indeed with casting out this new *Order* of *Presbyterate*, that is suppos'd to be destitute



destitute of the Power of proper *Pastors*; but we retain the true *Ignatian Episcopacy*, and allow none but *Bishops* to have any share of the Pastoral Charge of a Congregation. But on the other hand, if *Ignatius's Presbyters* were of the same Office with his *Bishops*, and the *Bishops* only claim'd such a Superiority over 'em as the *Parish-Rector* has over his *Curates*; All Arguments Mr. Dr — can draw from thence for a distinct Order (to which distinct and peculiar Powers belong) are overturn'd. Nay, if the *Pastor* of every particular Congregation be the *Ignatian Bishop*, then since all the Dissenting Teachers are ordain'd by several such *Pastors*, they are ordain'd by *Ignatian Bishops*; and therefore to censure their *Ordinations* as invalid, is to null all the *Ordinations* of that Age, and consequently entirely destroy the pretended *Line of Succession*. Nay, our *Ordinations* are according to the Language and Practice of those *Primitive Times* truly *Episcopal* ones, in which none concur but proper *Bishops*, not only in the Language of the Apostle *Paul* and *Clement*, but of *Ignatius* himself. Nothing therefore can be more unreasonable and absurd, than to declare those *Ordinations* null for want of the Concurrence of a *Bishop* in 'em, which are commonly perform'd by Six, nay, often Ten or Twelve such *Primitive Bishops*, whereas the Concurrence of Three such *Bishops* was reckon'd sufficient to a *Canonical Ordination* in the *Primitive Times*.

2. We may hence infer, That if *Ignatius's Bishop* was of *Divine Institution*, and was by *Divine Right* vested in all those Powers that our Author appropriates to *Bishops*, then the present *Diocesan Episcopacy* cannot be of *Divine Right*; nay must be built on the Subversion of the Rights of the *Ignatian Bishops*.

If *Ignatius's Parish-Bishop* was by *Divine Right* vested with the Spiritual Powers of *Confirmation*, *Excommunication* and *Ordination*, then a *Diocesan Bishop* that divests all the *Parish-Bishops*, for a large District (perhaps some Scores or Hundreds of 'em) of those Spiritual Powers that God had vested 'em in, and monopolizes

'em  
C. 11

'em all to himself, is so far from having any *Divine Right* according to the Judgment of *Ignatius* to plead for his Office, that his Office it self is erected on the Ruins of that *Episcopal Power* that *Ignatius* supposes his *Congregational Bishops* to be entrusted with by God, and such a *Diocesan Episcopacy* is not only (according to his Sentiments) a meer *Humane Constitution*, destitute of a *Divine Warrant*; but an unreasonable Invasion of the *Divine Rights* of many *Primitive Bishops* at once. So that the more the Patrons of the *Diocesan Cause*, magnify and cry up the *Divine Institution* of the *Ignatian Bishop*, the more effectually they sap the Foundation of their own Cause; the present *Diocesan* being entirely destructive of the *Ignatian Parochial Episcopacy*. To illustrate this Matter, let us suppose the several *Towns Corporate* in a large *County*, furnish'd by their Charter from the King with a Power relating both to *Civil* and *Criminal Causes*. Let us suppose that the *Mayor* of the *County-Town* shou'd engross all Power of punishing Criminals, not only for the *County-Town*, but for all the *Towns* in the *Province* or *Shire* to his own *Court*, and shou'd deprive the *Mayors* of all other *Towns-Corporate* in the *Province* of that Power in *Criminal Causes* the Charter has vested 'em with. Will any wise Man from thence conclude, That the *Mayor* of the *County-Town* has made no Essential Alteration in the Government of the *Province*? Or will he not think his monopolizing this Power of punishing Criminals, to be an unwarrantable Invasion of the Power of the other *Mayors* of Corporations in the *Province*? and consequently his new-assumed Power to be inconsistent with theirs? The Parallel is so obvious between the *Parochial* and the *Diocesan Bishop*, as to need no Application.

3. We may hence infer, That if the Power of *Ordination* do belong by *Divine Right* only to such a *Bishop* as *Ignatius* intends, then a *Diocesan Bishop* as such, has no Power to ordain at all. He cannot be vested with it under any other Character, than that of a *Congregatio-*

*gregational* or *Parish-Bishop*; for such a one *Ignatius's Bishop* was. And therefore the present *Episcopal Ordinations* are by no Means the *Episcopal Ordinations* of the *Ignatian Age*, being performed by a Sort of *Bishop* unknown in that Age, and whose Authority is inconsistent with that of the *Ignatian Bishops*; whereas the *Ordinations* called *Presbyterian*, are truly *Episcopal ones* in the Language of *Ignatius*, being perform'd by such *Parish-Pastors* as *Ignatius's Bishop* was; who have the same Charge, and the same Office and Power that his *Bishops* had. And consequently to argue from the meer Name of a *Bishop*, and his Distinction from, and Superiority to a *Presbyter* in *Ignatius's Time*, to make the present *Episcopal Ordinations* the same with those of the *Ignatian Age*, is to impose on the Reader with a meer Piece of Sophistry, which any one that considers how incompatible the *Ignatian* is with the present *Diocesan Episcopacy*, may at first View discern the palpable Absurdity of.

And now the Reader may see whether Mr. Dr—— had any Reason to tell him, “ That ’tis a great Satisfaction to every Member of the Churches of Ireland, “ to think, that they are govern’d by the same Order of “ Ecclesiastical Officers, as all the Church of Christ “ were when *Ignatius* wrote his Epistles. He may as well tell us, That every *Rector* of a *Parish-Church* is now a *Diocesan Bishop*, and that the *Assistant-Curates* of every such *Parish-Rector*, are the *Clergy* of the Diocese. And if he’ll trust one *Ignatius* more than Ten thousand *Baxters*, he’ll find that *St. Ignatius* and *Mr. Baxter* are both entirely of a Mind concerning the *Primitive Bishop*, and that *Mr. Baxter* with his two *Assistant Ministers* at *Kederminster*, was as truly the *Bishop* of that numerous Church, as ever *Damas* with his two *Presbyters Bassus* and *Apollonius* was *Bishop* of *Magnesia* in *Ignatius's Days*. And if he’ll reduce the Churches of Christ to the same Form of Government that obtain’d in *Ignatius's Time*, we’ll never complain of him as a *degenerate Christian*, and a *Favourer of the Kingdom of Antichrist*. And if any of us shou’d (as he speaks) *abhor such Ignatian*  
Bishops

*Bisb*  
*pas*  
*sion*  
*tha*  
*san*  
*ima*  
*I ho*  
*’em*  
*joy*  
*may*  
*men*  
*chie*  
*nish*

*I*  
*on t*  
*Plea*  
*Dioc*  
*are*  
*Igna*  
*give*  
*that*  
*Fir*

*M*  
*of h*  
*“ an*  
*“ co*  
*“ th*  
*“ n*  
*“ w*  
*C*  
*“ T*  
*“ P*

\* I  
si fun  
minif  
Pastor  
p. 80.



*Bishops, and eject them as Devils,* we'll be content to pass as severe a Doom on him as *Bishop Hall's* Expressions imply. But then I hope he'll not excuse those that actually procur'd the Ejection of near Two thousand such *Ignatian Bishops* at once, and that with all imaginable Marks of very unreasonable Hatred. Nay I hope he'll not excuse those that do still deprive all of 'em in every Diocess of several of the *Powers* they enjoy'd and exercis'd in *Ignatius's* Days. Mr. Dr—— may therefore see, that we need no stronger Arguments against the *Diocesan Constitution*, than what this chief *Witness* produc'd for the Support of it does furnish us with.

I hope the Reader will excuse my insisting so long on this *Testimony* of *Ignatius*, because as all the mighty Pleas of the modern Defenders of the *Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy* drawn from *Primitive Antiquity*, are chiefly founded on it; so the clearing of the *Ignatian Episcopacy* does entirely overturn 'em, and gives a considerable Light to all the other *Testimonies* that are drawn from the other Writers of the Three First Centuries.

Mr. Dr——'s next Witness is *Hermas* is those noted Words of his, “\*They are *Apostles* and *Bishops*, and *Doctors*, and *Ministers*, who thro' the Mercy of God have come into this building of Christ, and have manag'd the Episcopal Office, and have taught and have ministered holily and modestly to the Elect of God, who are fallen asleep.

Concerning this *Testimony* Mr. Dr—— tells us, “This holy Man by *Doctors* evidently understands *Presbyters*, as it is usual among ancient Writers: See

---

\* Ii sunt Apostoli, & Episcopi, & Doctores, & Ministri, qui ingressi sunt in clementiâ Dei, & Episcopatum gesserunt, & docuerunt, & ministraverunt Sanctè & modestè electis Dei qui dormierunt. *Hermas Pastor. Lib. 1. Vif. 3. Sect. 5. inter Clerici Patres Apostolicos, Vol. I. p. 80.*

“ that when *Blondell* argues for the *Episcopacy* of these  
 “ *Doctors*, and brings this Passage of *Hermas* to coun-  
 “ tenance him, it only shews how confident some  
 “ Men may be in the weakest Cause; for 'tis not only  
 “ against all Grammar, but contrary to *Hermas* him-  
 “ self in another Place, to say, it was the *Doctors* who  
 “ manag'd the *Episcopal Office*; for this pious Man tells  
 “ us, these *Doctors* were such who *preach'd* and *taught*.  
 “ Here then we have *Bishops* that govern'd, *Doctors* or  
 “ *Presbyters* who *taught*, and *Deacons* who *ministred*.

*Answ.* That *Hermas* here by *Doctors* understands  
*Presbyters*, as they are suppos'd to be of a distinct Or-  
 der or Office from *Bishops*, is so far from being evident,  
 (as Mr. Dr—pretends) that there is no probability of  
 it from any Thing that *Hermas* has said. For to make  
 any Thing like an *Argument* of this Testimony, it  
 must be shewn, that the *Oversight* or *Inspection* of a  
 Church, was a distinct Office from that of *Teaching* it,  
 and the Mark of a distinct and superior Officer in it. O-  
 therwise there is no Force at all in Mr. Dr——'s Argu-  
 ment, that because *Hermas* elsewhere saith, that these  
*Doctors preach't* and *taught*; therefore he cou'd not sup-  
 pose them to discharge the *Episcopal Office*. But that  
 the *Oversight* or *Inspection* of a Church was no distinct  
 Office from *Teaching*, nor any Mark of a superior Of-  
 ficer, is evident from the whole Strain of Antiquity.  
 If we look to the *Apostolical Age*, those *Elders* that la-  
 bour'd in *Word and Doctrine*, also rul'd in the Church. The  
*Elders* are requir'd *ἐπισκοπεῖν* to oversee the Flock; nay,  
 when those two Branches of their Power are compar'd  
 that of labouring in *Word and Doctrine* is the more honou-  
 rable than that of *Ruling*. If we look to *Clemens*, we  
 see that his *Presbyters* who were the *Teachers* of the  
 Church of *Corinth*, did also take the *Episcopacy* or *Over-*  
*sight* of it. If we look downwards to *Ignatius*, to *Ju-*  
*stin Martyr*, to *Tertullian's*, to *Cyprian's Age*, we find  
 that the *ἐπίσκοπος*, the *President*, the *Bishop* was the Or-  
 dinary *Teacher*; that the *Presbyters* after they were dis-  
 tinguish'd from the *Bishop* seldom *Preach'd* at all: But

we

we find 'em constantly concern'd in the *Rule or Government* of the Church; so that *Government* and *Rule* was no way the distinguishing Character of any *superior Officer*, but on the contrary, *Teaching* was the highest Branch of the true *Episcopal* or *Pastoral Power*. And therefore *Hermas* could not by *Doctors* understand any Office in the Church, *inferior* to that of *Bishops* and *Rulers* in it; and consequently, this Testimony of *Hermas* makes much more *against* than *for* any such Distinction between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* (And therefore the Censure Mr. Dr—— passes on the learned *Blondel*, as most confident, when he is most mistaken, may be justly retorted on himself.) Nay suppose we should grant that *Hermas* suppos'd such a Distinction between *Bishop* and *Presbyter*; yet what would this signify to Mr. Dr——'s Purpose, if it imply no other Distinction than what obtain'd when the Epistles of *Ignatius* were wrote; which as I have shewn, refers only to *Parochial Episcopacy*, and is inconsistent with *Diocesan Episcopacy*. And I may add, That if Mr. Dr—— suppose *Doctors* a distinct Office from *Bishops*, he must for the same Reason assert *Bishops* to be a distinct Office from *Apostles*, and that will destroy all his Pretensions of the *Apostolical* and *Episcopal* Office being the same.

For the Testimony of *Heraclius* which Mr. Dr—— cites from Dr. *Beveridge*, "*That Bishops were by the Appointment of Christ constituted over all the Earth*", it will be Time enough to consider it, when he proves, That *Heraclius* speaks of *Diocesan Bishops*, and not of *Presbyter-Bishops*, or *Parish-Rectors*. For if he intend the *Latter*, his Testimony is full against Mr. Dr——'s Cause; and he must mean the *Latter*, if he speak according to the common Strain of either *Clement* or *Ignatius* (as I have already shewn.)

Mr. Dr——'s next *Witness* being *Cyprian*, I shall before I consider his Testimony, take Notice of some eminent Writers that flourish'd before *Cyprian's Time*, and give us such an Account of the Constitution of the Primitive



mitive Churches as is no way favourable to Mr. Dr—'s Cause.

I shall begin with *Justin-Martyr* in that admirable and clear Account he has given of the Churches in his Time : “ † Then (saith he) is Bread and Wine brought  
“ to the President of the Brethren——After the *Pres-*  
“ *dent* has given Thanks, and the whole People has  
“ made their devout Acclamations, they that are cal-  
“ led Deacons among us, give to every one a Part of  
“ the Bread, and of the Wine mix'd with Water, over  
“ which Thanks had been given, and suffer it to be car-  
“ ried to the Absent. And again, \* On Sunday, Those  
“ in the City and Country assemble together, where  
“ the Writings of the Apostles and Prophets are read

† Ἐπειτα προσφέρειται τὸ πρὸς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ πὺ-  
τῆριον ὕδατος καὶ κρημάλει. ——— Ἐυχαισθῶσι δὲ τὰ πρὸς  
ἐσθῶτι, καὶ ἐπιδρημῶσι παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλέμφοι παρὶ  
ἡμῶν διάκονοι, διδόντες ἕκαστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ  
εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς ἑκ παρῆς ἀποστείλουσιν.  
*Justin Mart. Apolog. vulgò II. revera I. in Oper. p. 97.*

\* Τῇ τῷ ἡλίῳ λειτουργίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μεμνη-  
των ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλθουσιν γίνεσθαι, καὶ τὰ ὑπομνημονόματα τοῦ  
ἁποστόλου, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκειν μέχρι  
ἐγχευεῖ. εἴτα παυσάμενός τῃ ἀναγνώσκοντι, ὁ πρὸς τὸν διὰ λόγου  
τῷ νουθετοῦ καὶ πεινκλῶσιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τέτων μιμήσεως ποιῶ-  
ται. Ἐπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχαὶ πέμπομεν καὶ σταν-  
σαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἀρτὸν προσφέρειν καὶ δινόν καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ  
πρὸς τὸν εὐχαὶ ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει,  
καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ ἀμήν. καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μεταλαβὴ  
ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἕκαστῳ γίνεσθαι, καὶ τοῖς ἑκ παρῆς διὰ τῶν  
διακόνων πέμπειν. οἱ εὐποροῦντες δὲ καὶ ἐκλόμοι, κατὰ περιουσίαν  
ἕκαστος τῷ ἑαυτοῦ, ὃ ἐκέλευε διδόναι. καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ τῷ  
πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὅπουκερ ὀρφανοὶ τε καὶ χήραι, καὶ  
τοῖς διὰ νόσον ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λεπτομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐκ διασπο-  
ρῆς, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις ἔστι ξένοις, καὶ ἀπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ  
χρείας ἔστι κηδεμῶν γίνεσθαι. *Ibid. p. 98, 99.*

“ as much as the Time will allow. The Reader cea-  
 “ sing, the President makes an Exhortation. — After  
 “ this, we all rise and offer our Prayers. Which being  
 “ ended, Bread, Wine, and Water are brought forth.  
 “ Then the *President* according to his Ability, offers  
 “ Prayers and Thanksgivings, and the People say, *Amen*.  
 “ Then the consecrated Elements are given to every  
 “ one present, and sent to the Absent by the *Deacons*.  
 “ The Rich contribute what they please. The Colle-  
 “ ctions are lodg’d with the *President*. He relieves Or-  
 “ phans, Widows, the Sick and Indigent, Prisoners  
 “ and Strangers; and in short, takes care of all the  
 “ Poor.

I will freely grant what the Generality of the Pa-  
 trons of *Diocesan Episcopacy* plead for, That the *Præpo-*  
*situs* or *President* of the Brethren, was the *Bishop* as then  
 distinguish’d from the *Presbyters*; it being with the *Bi-*  
*shop* that the Collections were usually deposited (as the  
*Apostolical Constitutions* inform us.) But then ’tis as  
 manifest, That this *Bishop* or *President* was but the  
*Pastor* of a *Parish-Church* or *single Congregation*; It was  
 he ordinarily preach’d and pray’d and administred the  
*Lord’s-Supper* to his whole Church, and sent the conse-  
 crated Elements by the *Deacons*, to those Members  
 that were absent from the Publick Worship.

And Dr. *Maurice’s* Evasion, has no manner of Foun-  
 dation in *Justin Martyr*, when he interprets this last  
 Passage concerning the *Bishop’s* sending the consecrated  
 Elements from his Church, to *several Assemblies* in the  
 same City. For we see that both those of the City or  
 Town, and of the Country about it, came together to  
 make up this Assembly or Congregation wherein the  
*Præpositus* or *Bishop* did preside. And nothing can be  
 more weak and trifling than the Reason he offers to  
 support so improbable a Conjecture, “ That the Ele-  
 “ ments could not be conveniently carried by the  
 “ *Deacons* to the absent Members, as they were dis-  
 “ pers’d in their several Dwellings, and that in nume-  
 “ rous Congregations, it was not easy to know who

"was not present." For when each Congregation had several *Deacons*, and when few were wont to be *absent* from the Assembly, except in Case of *Sickness* or *Necessity*, where was the Difficulty of the *Deacons* carrying the consecrated Elements to a few such *absent* Members? Nor was there any greater Difficulty in the *Deacons* observing who were absent, when they had a List of their Members, or in the *absent* Members themselves sending to desire that these Symbols of Christian Communion might be brought to 'em, when they were by involuntary Necessity hindered from attending the Publick Worship. And 'tis manifest, That *Justin Martyr* speaks of *absent Persons* and not of *absent Congregations*, to whom the *Deacons* cou'd not carry so much of the consecrated Elements as might suffice for them to receive; and I hope *Dr. Maurice* will not suppose 'em carried only for *Sham* and not for *Use*. For what the *Doctor* alledges concerning *Victor* and *Lucian* the Martyr, 'tis noway Parallel to this Case, and therefore *Mr. Mede's* Observation is just, "That they had not many Places to celebrate in, (each Bishop having but one Communion-Table for his Church.)"

To the like Purpose *Tertullian* gives an Account of the Churches in his Time, (a) We meet together that "we may join our Hands in Prayer to God. We are brought together to call the Divine Scriptures to our Remembrance. We beg Faith with holy Cries; we raise our Hope, fix our Confidence, we inforce our

(a) Coimus ad Deum, quasi manu facta precationibus ambiamus. [Legit. Beat. Rhenanus, Coimus in cœtum & congregationem, ut ad Deum quasi, &c.]—Coimus ad literarum Divinarum commemorationem. —Certe fidem Sanctis vocibus pascimus, spem erigimus, fiduciam figimus, disciplinam præceptorum nihilominus inculcationibus densamus. Ibidem etiam exhortationes, castigationes, & censura divina. Nam & judicatur magno cum pondere, ut apud certos de Dei conspectu, summumque futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a communicatione orationis, & conventus, & omnis Sancti commercii relegatur. Præsident probati quoque Seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti. *Apolog. c. 39. Oper. p. 31.*



“ Discipline with the Inculcation of (the Divine) Pre-  
 “ cepts. There are also Exhortations, Chastisements  
 “ and Divine Censure; for (the Offender) is judg’d  
 “ with great Weight, as by those that are certain that  
 “ they are in the Sight of God. And ’tis the highest  
 “ *Preludium* of the future Judgment, if any one have  
 “ so offended, as to be excluded from Communion in  
 “ Prayer, and in the Assembly, and in all religious  
 “ Commerce. Certain approved Elders preside who  
 “ have obtain’d their Office by Merit, and not by  
 “ Bribes.

And again he tells us, “ (b) That they receiv’d the  
 “ Sacrament of the Eucharist from the Hands of none  
 “ but such as *presided* (in their Assemblies.)

And farther, he tells us, “ (c) That before they  
 “ went to the Water to be baptiz’d, they first in the  
 “ Church under the Hand of the *President* (or Ruler of  
 “ the Church) profess’d their Renouncing the Devil,  
 “ &c.

And farther, We learn from the same *Autor*, that  
 the Christians in his Time communicated thrice a Week,  
*viz. Wednesdays and Fridays and Lord’s-Days. Similiter*  
*Et Stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum Ora-*  
*tionibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit accepto*  
*corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium Eucharis-*  
*tia resolvit, an magis Deo obligat? Nonne sollemior erit*  
*statio tua, si Et ad Aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore*  
*Domini, Et reservato, utrumque salvum est, Et partici-*  
*patio Sacrificii Et Executio Officii. Tert. de Oratione. c. 14.*  
*Oper. p. 135, 136.*

(b) Eucharistiae Sacramentum omnibus mandatum a Domino, —  
 nec de aliorum manu quam praesidentium Sumimus. *De Corona, c. 3.*  
*Oper. p. 102.*

(c) Aquam adituri [nempe, ut baptizemur] ibidem, sed & aliquantò  
 prius in Ecclesia sub Antistitis manu contestamur nos renunciare diabo-  
 lo, &c. *Ibid.*

Now from these Passages of *Tertullian* I may justly thus argue. Either there was in *Tertullian's* Time no Distinction between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, or there was. If there *was not*, this Point of Primitive Antiquity must be wholly given up; if there *was*, either *Tertullian* by these *probati Seniores*, approved Elders, these *Presidentes* and *Antistites*, that had the Presidency and chief Rule in their religious Assemblies, intends *Bishops* or *Presbyters*, or both. If *Presbyters only*, then where shall we find any such Thing in *Tertullian* as a *Bishop*, as distinct from *Presbyters* at all? And if these were *Presbyters*, Mr. Dr—— must drop one of his distinguishing Characters of *Episcopal Power*, viz. *Excommunication*, since in passing that solemn Sentence *Tertullian* tells us, these approved Elders did preside. Nay, if we suppose that *Tertullian* by *Presidentes* includes both *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, it will still follow, that he makes the Power of inflicting Church-Censures common to both, and supposes both to be of the same Order or Office, tho' the *Bishop* might have the like Superiority as a *Rector* among his *Curates*. On the other Hand, if *Tertullian* mean *Bishops* as distinguish'd from *Presbyters* (as I shall freely own he does in several other Places suppose there was some Distinction between 'em) then 'tis evident, they cou'd be no more than *Congregational-Bishops*. For since he tells us, " They " receiv'd the Holy Eucharist only from the Hands of " these *Presidentes*, and yet receiv'd it in every Church " or *Congregation thrice a Week*; How is it possible for any one Man to administer the Sacrament *thrice a Week* on the same Days to several *Congregations*? And this besides his baptizing and Censuring all scandalous Offenders, and Preaching. The Dispute then may be brought to a short Issue, we will allow *Tertullian's* *Bishop* as large a Church as he can conscientiously perform all this to; and then we may safely conclude him to be no more than a *Congregational Bishop*. And I have already told Mr. Dr—— we have such *Bishops* already, and 'tis ridiculous in him to reproach us for re-  
jecting

jectin  
Congr  
Righ  
and p  
Powe  
And  
unde  
never  
Te  
Here  
" na  
" (c  
" co  
" fo  
" M  
" th  
" es  
" Pa  
" of  
" Cl  
" e  
" ce  
B  
I we  
out c  
" W  
" th  
" th  
+  
rum  
Episc  
Apost  
mod  
clesia  
Clem  
hiber  
nis  
p. 2

jecting *Primitive Episcopacy*, or to alledge this *Primitive Congregational Episcopacy*, for the Defence of the Divine Right of that *Diocesan Episcopacy* that is destructive of it, and particularly deprives these *Primitive Bishops* of the Power of *Excommunication* that then belong'd to 'em. And of such *Congregational Bishops*, we must therefore understand that Passage which so many triumph in, who never consider the Disservice it does to their Cause.

*Tertullian* is challenging the *Marcionites* and other *Hereticks*; " Let them (saith he†) produce the Original of their Churches, let them turn over the Order (or Roll) of their Bishops, so running down in a continued Succession, that their first Bishop had some one of the Apostles, or of the Apostolick Men (who persever'd with the Apostles) for his Author and Predecessor. Thus the Apostolical Churches have their Rolls, as the Church of *Smyrna* has *Polycarp* constituted there by *John*; and the Church of *Rome*, *Clement* ordain'd by *Peter*. And other Churches can tell, who were ordain'd Bishops over 'em by the Apostles, and who have been their Successors to this Day.

Before I enter on the Consideration of this Passage, I wou'd only present to the Reader that Parallel one out of *Irenæus*, where speaking of *Hereticks*, he saith, " We challenge 'em to that Tradition which is from the Apostles, which is preserv'd in the Churches by the Successions of the Presbyters. And how misfe-

---

† Edant Origines Ecclesiarum suarum : evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem & antecessorem. Hoc enim modo Ecclesia Apostolica census suos deferunt : sicut *Smyrnæorum* Ecclesia *Polycarpum* ab *Joanne* conlocatum refert : sicut *Romanorum*, *Clementem* a *Petro* ordinatum itidem. Perinde utique & ceteræ exhibent quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos Apostolici seminis praduces habeant. *Tertull. de Prescription. Heretic. c. 32. Oper. p. 213.*



rably Mr. Dr—— has perverted this Passage, I shall have Occasion to shew afterwards.

In this Passage of *Tertullian*, we must consider what *Bishops* he means, whether *Congregational* or properly *Diocesan Bishops*? That he understands only the former, will clearly appear not only from the Passages already mention'd, which plainly confine his *Presidents* to one particular Church or Congregation as their ordinary Charge, but from this Passage it self. Thus *Polycarp* is one of the *Bishops* he mentions as constituted by *John* at *Smyrna*; and that he was but the *Pastor* of a single Congregation, is manifest from the Charge of *Ignatius* to him (as the Reader may see fully prov'd above p. 90.) And for *Clement* the other *Bishop*, his whole Church at *Rome* concurr'd in the Letter he penn'd in their Name to the Church of *Corinth*; and that the Church of *Corinth* was but a single Congregation, has been already prov'd from several Passages in that *Epistle*. Nay tho' we shou'd grant that this Passage proves the Churches of *Smyrna* and *Rome*, to be chiefly entrusted to *Polycarp* and *Clement*, yet it by no Means intimates the *Presbyters* there, to have been of a different Order or Office from em. Shou'd we have a Roll of all that have successively been *Rectors* of a *Parish-Church*, we shou'd not expect to find all the Names of their *Assistant-Curates*. And it lies on Mr. Dr—— to prove, that the *Presbyters* who assisted these *Bishops*, did any otherwise differ from em. I have shewn, that *Clement* in his *Epistle* knew of no Officer in the Church of *Corinth*, distinct from, and superior to the *Presbyters* in it. And for *Polycarp* himself, if we consider the Inscription of his *Epistle*, viz: *Polycarp and the Presbyters that are with him, to the Church of God that dwells at Philippi*, it carries no Marks at all of any Superiority of Order and Office; the most that it can imply, is only his being the *First* or *Chief Presbyter*. And the *Epistle* it self is so far from countenancing any such Opinion, that that holy Martyr exhorts the younger Persons in that Church

Church of Philippi † to be subject to their Presbyters and Deacons, as to God and Christ, without any mention of their Bishop as any Officer of a distinct Order and Rank from the Presbyters. Nay he exhorts the \* Presbyters themselves to be “ Full of Pity, Merciful to all, reducing those that wander, visiting the Sick, not neglecting the Widows, Orphans, or the Poor, but providing what is good before God and Men, abstaining from all Wrath, partial respect of Persons, unjust Judgment, abstaining from all Avarice, not forward to believe any Thing ill against any Man, not too severe in Judgment, as knowing we are all guilty of Faults.

By these Words 'tis manifest, That Polycarp supposes the Power of Church-Censures, to be lodg'd in these Presbyters of the Church at Philippi, and gives not the least Intimation of its being engros'd into the Hand of an Officer of a distinct Order from 'em. So that the State of the Church of Philippi seems to be much the same with that of Corinth, when Clemens wrote his Epistle to 'em, where there appears not so much as a Distinction of Degree between the Presbyters. But shou'd we allow such a Distinction of Degree to have obtain'd, 'tis evidently no more than that between a Parochial Bishop and his Assistant-Colleagues.

---

† Διδόνειον ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ πάντων τέτων, ὑποτασσόμενος τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις, ὡς θεῷ καὶ χριστῷ. Polycarp. Epist. ad Phil. Sect. 5. pag. 186.

\* Καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι εὐσπλαγνοὶ, εἰς πάντας ἐλεήμονες, ὡς πατέρες τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα, ὅπισθεπτόμενοι πάντας ἀδελφεῖς, μὴ ἀμελεῖντες χήρας, ἢ ὀρφανῶν, ἢ πένητον· ἀλλὰ φρονεῖντες αἰεὶ τὸ καλὸν ἐνώπιον θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ὀργῆς, προσωποληψίας, κείσεως ἀδίκης, μακρὸν ὄντες πάσης φιλαργυρίας, μὴ ταχέως πσεύδοιτες κατὰ πλῆθος, μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν κείσει, εἰδότες ὅτι πάντες ὀφείλεται ἐσμεν ἁμαρτίας. Ibid. Sect. 6.

To all this I may add, That the *Epistle of the Church of Smyrna* concerning the Martyrdom of *Polycarp*, never once mentions any superior Office he bare in that Church above the rest of the *Presbyters* in it.

For the Two Passages which Mr. Dr—— produces from *Origen*, I must desire him to review 'em, and shew us what there is in 'em, that can in the least serve the Cause of *Diocesan* Episcopacy. In the former of 'em *Origen* tells us, “† That the Bishops applied to themselves the Promise made to *Peter*, teaching, that they had receiv'd the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven from our Saviour, so that whatever was bound (*i. e.* condemned) by them on Earth, was bound in Heaven, &c. Which may be Orthodoxly enough applied to 'em if they held *Peter's* Confession, and are such as the Church of Christ may be built upon.

But what signifies this to prove, That this Power of *Binding* and *Loosing* belong'd to Bishops as distinguish'd from *Presbyters*? Whereas 'tis manifest, that *Presbyters* always concurr'd with the Bishop in all Church-Censures? And what signifies this to prove, That these Bishops were any more than *Congregational Bishops*? If Mr. Dr—— wou'd have produc'd *Origen* to any Purpose, he shou'd have shewn, that the Bishop in his Time assumed to himself this Power of *Binding* and *Loosing* over all the Congregations within such a District, that had each their own *Communion-Tables*. But *Origen* is

† Ἐπεὶ ὁ οἱ τὸν τόπον τῆ ἐπισκοπῆς ἐνδικένεις χρῶνται τῷ ῥυτῷ, ὡς πέτρος; καὶ τὰς κλείδας τῶν ἔργων βασιλείας ἀπὸ τῆ σωτῆρος εἰληφότες διδάσκουσιν τε τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν δεδεμένα, τετέστι κατὰ διδασκαλίαν καὶ ἐν ἔργοις δεδέσθαι, καὶ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀφίστην εἰληφότα, καὶ ἐν ἔργοις λελύθαι· λεκτέον ὅτι ὡς λέγουσιν, εἰ ἔχουσιν ἔργον δι' ὃ εἴρηται ἐκείνῳ τῷ πέτρῳ σὺ εἶ πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ λίθῃ οἱ εἰσιν, ὡς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ χειρὸς οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *Origen, Comm. in Matth, Op. Græc, Vol. i. p. 279.*



so far from supposing any such Thing, that \* he describes the *Criminal as appearing before the whole Church* whereof he was a Member; and not before any *Consistorial Court* of the Bishop.

And for the other Passage, “† If Jesus Christ the “ Son of God is subject to *Joseph and Mary*, shall not “ I be subject to the Bishop, who is ordain’d of God “ to be my Father? Shall not I be subject to the Pres- “ byter, who by the Divine Appointment is set over “ me? I must desire Mr. Dr—— to try his Skill, how he can from these Words of *Origen* prove either of these two Things, viz. Either that *Origen* here asserts any Distinction of Office or Order between a *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, or indeed any greater than there is between the *Rector* of a Parish and his *Assistant-Curates*. Or that he supposes this Bishop to have not one Communicating Church, but several such Churches under his Government; and till he has prov’d these two Things, *Origen’s* Testimony signifies nothing to his Purpose. Whereas *Origen’s* Words last cited do rather imply, that the *Bishop* and *Presbyter* m’d together in the same Church, every Member whereof was to be as truly subject to the *Presbyter* as to the *Bishop*, tho’ to the *Bishop* as the chief Pastor of it.

And if he’ll please to consult him farther, he’ll find that *Origen* supposes only two distinct Offices in the Church, viz. \*\* *The Priests who are the Eye of the Church*

\* Ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀχθεῖς. — ἢ μὴ ἐπὶ συνδύναι τῶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τῶ ἐκκλησίας ἐλέγχῃ. *Ibid.* p. 335.

† Si Jesus filius Dei subjicitur Joseph & Mariæ, ego non subjiciar Episcopo qui mihi a Deo ordinatus est pater. Non subjiciar presbytero, qui mihi Domini dignatione prepositus est. *Origen. Homil. 20. in Luc. Op. Lat. Vol. 2. p. 265.*

\*\* Sacerdotes rationabiliter possunt dici ecclesie oculus, quoniam & speculatores habentur: Diaconi autem ceterique ministri manus, quoniam per eos opera spiritalia universa geruntur. *Origen. in Matth. Tract. 5. Op. Lat. Vol. 2. p. 65. [Huetius; Greek Edition omits the Passage.]*

as being the Watchmen thereof, and the Deacons (with those under them) to be the Hand of the Church, by whom its spiritual Works are managed. And † he makes the Bishop and Presbyters to be only one Priestly Order, and the Deacons to be the Levitical. And \* he ascribes a Presidency to all the Clergy.

His next Witness is Clemens Alexandrinus, who tells us (saith Mr. Dr——) “That the Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons were according to the Rank and Dispensation of Angels, *Strom. lib. 6. p. 667.*”

But if Mr. Dr—— had been pleas'd to produce the whole Passage at length, he might have seen, that instead of countenancing the Doctrine of Three distinct Offices or Orders, it plainly overthrows it. I shall therefore lay the whole Passage before the Reader. || “For the Processes of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons in the Church, I think 'em to be Imitations of the Angelical Glory, and of that Dispensation, which as the Scriptures say, they wait for, who treading in the Steps of the Apostles, live in the Perfection of Evangelical Righteousness; for these the Apostle writes, (1 Thess. IV.) shall be taken up into the

† Unde est quod sæpè audimus blasphemare homines, & dicere, ecce qualis episcopus, aut qualis Presbyter, vel qualis diaconus? Nonne hæc dicuntur ubi vel sacerdos, vel minister Dei visus fuerit in aliquo contra ordinem suum venire, & aliquid contra sacerdotalem, vel leviticum ordinem gerere? *Origen. in Numer. Homil. 2. Op. Lat. Vol. 1. p. 207.*

\* Οἱ ἀπὸ κλήρε πνέουσες καὶ ὁμοῦ οὐκ ὄντες. *Homil. 1. in Jerem. Op. Græc. Vol. 1. p. 113.*

|| Ἐπεὶ καὶ αἱ ἐνταῦθα κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν πρεσβυτεροὶ, ἐπισκόποι, πρεσβύτεροι, διακόνες, μιμήματα οἶμαι Ἀγγελικῆς δόξης, καὶ κείνης τῆς οἰκονομίας τυγχάνουσιν, ὡς ἀναμένειν φασὶν αἱ γραφαὶ τὰς κατ' ἑκαστὴν Ἀποστόλων ἐν τελειώσει δικαιοσύνης κατὰ τὸ Ἐυαγγέλιον βεβαιώτας, ἐν νεφέλαις τέτες ἀρδεύσας γράφει ὁ Ἀπόστολος, διακονήσασθαι μὲν τὰ πρῶτα ἑπειὶ ἐγκατασταθῆναι τὸ πρεσβυτερίον κατὰ πρεσβυτερίαν δόξης. δόξα γὰρ δόξης διαφέρει, ἄχρεις ἂν εἰς τέλειον ἀνδρῶν αὐξήσωσιν. *Clem. Alex. Stromat. VI. pag. 667.*

“ Clouds

“ Clouds, and there first as Deacons attend, and then  
 “ according to the next Process of Glory, be admit-  
 “ ted into the Presbytery. For Glory differs from  
 “ Glory till they increase to a perfect Man.

On this very Passage Sir P. K. — (in his *Inquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church*, Part 1st. 8vo. Lond. 1691. pag. 100.) has this just Remark.

In this Passage there are two Things which manifest;  
 “ That there were but two Ecclesiastical Orders, viz.  
 “ Bishops and Deacons, or Presbyters and Deacons. The First  
 “ is, That he saith, Those Orders were resembled by the  
 “ Angelick Orders: Now the Scriptures mention but two  
 “ Orders, viz. Archangels and Angels, the Archangels  
 “ presiding over the Angels, and the Angels obeying  
 “ and attending on the Archangels. According to this  
 “ Resemblance therefore, there must be but two Eccle-  
 “ siastical Orders in the Church, which are Bishops or  
 “ Presbyters presiding and governing, with the Deacons  
 “ attending and obeying. The other Part of this Pas-  
 “ sage which proves but two Ecclesiastical Orders, is  
 “ his likening of 'em to the progressive Glory of the  
 “ Saints, who at the Judgment-Day shall be caught up  
 “ in the Clouds, and there shall first as Deacons at-  
 “ tend and wait on Christ's Judgment-Seat; and then  
 “ when the Judgment is over, shall have their Glory  
 “ perfected in being plac'd on the celestial Thrones of  
 “ that sublime Presbytery, where they shall be for ever  
 “ bless'd and happy.

“ So that there were only the two Orders of Deacons  
 “ and Presbyters, the former whereof being the inferior  
 “ Order, never sat at their Ecclesiastical Conventions,  
 “ but like Servants stood and waited on the Latter,  
 “ [Orig, in *Cantic. Hom. 2.*] Who sat on *ἑδραί* or Seats,  
 “ [Cypr. Ep. 40. p. 225.] in the Form of a Semicircle,  
 “ whence they are call'd frequently *Conventus Presbyterii*,  
 “ or the Confession of the Presbytery; in which Session,  
 “ he that was more peculiarly the Bishop or Minister  
 “ of the Parish, sat at the Head of the Semicircle on a  
 “ Seat somewhat elevated above those of his Colleagues,  
 (as



“ (as Cyprian calls 'em) and so was distinguish'd from  
 “ 'em by his Priority in the same Order, but not by his  
 “ being of another Order. Thus the foresaid Clemens Alex-  
 “ andrinus distinguishes the Bishop from the Presbyters,  
 “ by his being advanc'd to the *πρῶτον καὶ δόξα* or first  
 “ Seat in the Presbytery, not by his sitting in a different  
 “ Seat from them. For thus he writes, “ He is in  
 “ Truth a Presbyter of the Church, and a Minister of the  
 “ Will of God, who does and teaches the Things of the  
 “ Lord, not ordain'd by Men, nor esteem'd just because  
 “ a Presbyter, but because just, therefore receiv'd into the  
 “ Presbytery, who altho' he be not honour'd with the first  
 “ Seat on Earth, yet shall hereafter sit down on the  
 “ Twenty-four Thrones mention'd in the Revelations,  
 “ judging the People. So that both Bishops and Presby-  
 “ ters were Members of the same Presbytery, only the  
 “ Bishop was advanc'd to the first and chiefest Seat there-  
 “ in; which is the same Thing with what I come now  
 “ from proving, viz. that Bishops and Presbyters were  
 “ equal in Order, but different in Degree; that the  
 “ former were the Ministers of their respective Parishes,  
 “ the latter their Curates or Assistants.

I may add, That Clemens Alexandrinus elsewhere  
 † mentions only two Orders or Offices in the Church, the  
 former he calls *ἐκκλησίαν*, the latter *ὑπερεκκλησίαν*. The  
 former he ascribes to the Presbyters, the latter to the  
 Deacons. And he tells us, “ That by both these Mini-  
 “ stries, both Angels in Heaven, and Saints on Earth,  
 “ serv'd God in the Dispensation of the Affairs of this  
 “ Earth. And tho' in that Passage he make no men-

---

† Κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τὴν μὲν ἐκκλησίαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι  
 παύσιν εἰκόνα· τὴν ὑπερεκκλησίαν δὲ οἱ διάκονοι. ταύτας ἀμφω τὰς  
 διακονίας ἀγγελοι καὶ ὑπερεκκλησίαι τῷ Θεῷ κατὰ τὴν τῶν περιγίων  
 οἰκονομίαν, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ γνωστὸς. Clem. Alex. Stromat. VII.  
 p. 700.

tion of *Bishops* at all, yet no doubt he includes the *Bishops* among the *Presbyters*, as one that in his Time had the chief *Seat* among 'em (as was observ'd before).

And that this *Bishop* and these *Presbyters*, had but one *Church* with one *Communion-Table* under their Charge, is evident from the very Form of their *Sitting* in it. And there is nothing in *Clemens Alexandrinus*, that intimates any Difference in this Point, from what we have shewn to be the usual Extent of the *Bishop's* Charge in that Age. If Mr. Dr—— can produce any Thing in this *Author*, to prove that the *Bishop* had many *Churches*, with their distinct *Altars* or *Communion-Tables* under his Government, I am ready to consider it, but believe he'll do it *ad Gracas Calendas*.

For that other Passage of *Clemens Alexandrinus* cited by Mr. Dr—— “That some Precepts are given to the “*Presbyters*, others to *Bishops*, others to *Widows*. As it no way determines what *Distinction* he made between *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, nor of what extent he suppos'd the *Bishop's* Charge to be, so it can signify very little to Mr. Dr——'s Cause. But if *Clemens Alexandrinus* do here refer to the Directions given by *St. Paul* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, concerning the *Officers* they were to constitute in the *Churches* they were sent to; 'tis manifest, that they contain no Precepts directed to *Bishops* as distinguish'd from *Presbyters*. But those whom *St. Paul* calls *Bishops*, 1 *Tim.* III. he calls both *Presbyters* and *Bishops*, 1 *Tit.* and makes their *Qualifications* and their *Office* the same. He mentions indeed the *Deacons* as a distinct Order, and it wou'd tempt one to think that *Clemens* mean't them, when the *Widows* come next, of whom they were to take the Care. But if he mean't *Bishops* as distinct from *Presbyters*, and refer to those Places of the New-Testament; the Matter will be brought to a short Issue, viz. Whether the Authority of *Clemens*, or that of *St. Paul* shou'd weigh most with us?

Mr. Dr——

Mr. Dr — tells us, “ He cou’d bring the *Apostolical Canons* to countenance his Assertion, which every where declare the same Distinction.

Why Mr. Dr — did not mention the *Apostolical Constitutions*, or whether he include them among the *Canons*, I shall not enquire. But tho’ I shall readily own to him, that these *Constitutions* and *Canons* mention the same *Distinction* between *Bishop* and *Presbyters* that occurs in the *Epistles* ascrib’d to *Ignatius*, yet that this *Bishop* was no more than a *Congregational* or *Parish-Bishop*, is so evident to any that will impartially consider ’em, that I shall take some Pains to set that Matter in so clear a Light, as may with all unprejudic’d Persons put it out of Dispute. And I have already shewn Mr. Dr — what Consequences may be drawn from it to the utter Ruin of the Cause he pleads for, viz. a Conformity of the present *Diocesan* to the *Primitive Episcopal Government*, and that as founded on *Divine Right*.

I must therefore desire the Reader to peruse and weigh the following Passages.

*Lib. II. cap. 10.* Having exhorted the Bishop to a blameless Life, lest he bring a Stain on his own Igni-  
nity, and on the Church of God seated in his Parish, he thus speaks concerning the scandalous offenders that may be brought before him. (a) “ When the Of-  
fender

(a) Εἰ βλέπει ὁ ἁμαρτῶν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον καὶ τὰς διακόνους αἰδώς ἐκκλησίασθαι, καὶ τὸ ποίμνιον καθαρὸν ὑπάρχειν, πρῶτον μὲν, ὅταν μῶσαι καθαρομένης, εἰς ἐκκλησίαν Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν. πληροῦμεν τῇ συνειδήσει αὐτῶν εἰ ὅ παρ’ ἐδὲν ἡγασάμεθα εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ ὡς χρεῖμα ἐλεγχθήσεται, ὡς Ὁζᾶ κ. τ. λ. καὶ παροῦσιν πμωρηθήσεται ἢ νεκρεύμεθα ὑπὸ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, εἰς μετάνοιαν ὑπαχθήσεται πεισθέντες ὅτι τὰς κατένα, καὶ ἐν ἐδὲν μῶμον οὐείσαν, ἐπὶ παρ’ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἐπὶ μὲν παρ’ τῷ ὑπ’ αὐτὸν τελεγεῖται λαῶν, αἰσχυρῶν, μετὰ αἰδῶς καὶ πολλῶν δακρύων ἔξελεύσεται εἰρηνικῶς, κατανενυγμένῳ, καὶ μὲν καθαρισμὸν τὸ ποίμνιον. προσκλάσει τὸ πῶ  
Θεῶ,



“ fender shall know that the Bishop and Deacons are  
 “ blameless, and the Flock undefil'd, he will at first  
 “ being terrified in his own Conscience, not dare con-  
 “ temptuously to enter into the Church of God. But  
 “ if, not regarding that, he shall enter, he will either  
 “ straight be reprov'd, &c. and punish'd, or being  
 “ admonish'd by his Pastor, he will become penitent.  
 “ And having beheld every one, and finding no Spot  
 “ (or Stain) in either the Bishop or in the People sub-  
 “ ject to him, being fill'd with Confusion and Com-  
 “ punction, he'll peaceably go out with Shame and  
 “ with many Tears. And the Flock will continue  
 “ pure, but he'll mourn in the Sight of God and re-  
 “ pent of his Sin ; so he will have good Hope, and  
 “ the whole Flock seeing his Tears, will learn, That  
 “ the Offender by Repentance is deliver'd from De-  
 “ struction.

(b) Cap. 16. “ When thou (*speaking to the Bishop*)  
 “ shalt see any one to be a Delinquent, do thou with  
 “ just Resentment command him to be cast out of the  
 “ Church. And when he goes out, let the Deacons  
 “ express their Trouble, and having found him detain  
 “ him without the Church. Let them afterwards  
 “ come in and intercede with thee (*the Bishop*) for

Θεῶν, καὶ μετάνοήσει ἐφ' οἷς ἡμαρτήεν· καὶ ἔξει ἐλπίδα, καὶ τὸ ποίμνιον  
 ὅλον διασώμνον ἐκείνῃ τὰ δάκρυα, νενοσίαν ἔξει, ὅπ' ἀμαρτῶν δια-  
 μετάνοιαν ἐκ ἀπόλλυται. Constitut. Apostol. Lib. II. cap. 10.  
 See also cap. 12.

(b) Ἰδὼν δὲ σὺ τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα, πικρανθεὶς κέλευσον αὐτὸν ἔξω  
 βληθῆναι, καὶ ὡς ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ πικραίνεσθωσαν οἱ διάκονοι, καὶ ἐπιζητήαν-  
 τες κατεχέτωσαν αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ εἰσελθόντες ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ σε  
 ἐρωτάτωσαν. ——— Τότε συ κελύσεις εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀνα-  
 κείνας εἰ μέλανοι, καὶ ἄξιός ἐστιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ὅλως ᾧραδεχθῆναι,  
 σιῶσας αὐτὸν ἡμέρας νησιῶν κατὰ τὸ ἀμάρτημα, ἐβδομάδας δύο,  
 ἢ τρεῖς, ἢ πέντε, ἢ ἑπτὰ, ἕως αὐτὸν ἀπολύσον, εἰπὼν αὐτῷ ὅσα  
 ἀρμόζει ἡμαρτηκότι εἰς νενοσίαν ἐμπλήροσθαι διδάσκων καὶ ᾧραίνων.  
 Ibid. cap. 16.

K

“ him

him. — Then thou shalt order him to come in, and having examin'd whether he be penitent, and be worthy to be admitted into the Church, thou shalt upon his fasting for Two, Three, Five, or Seven Weeks, according to the Nature of his Offence, dismiss him, having spoken by way of Chastisement or reproof, what is proper for an Offender to be wholesomely taught and admonish'd of, &c.

(c) Cap. 18. " Let the Bishop take Care of all, both of those that have not sinn'd, that they may persevere in their Innocence, and of those that have sinn'd, that they may repent. For to you the Lord saith, see that ye despise not one of these little ones. — Wherefore take upon thee the Care of all, as one that must give an Account to God for many. Preserve the Sound, reprove Offenders, and raise up those by Remission that are cast down with Fasting, and receive again him that sighs; the whole Church interceding for him, and laying Hands on him, suffer him to remain with the Flock. But for the Drowsy and Sluggish, rouse, support, quicken, encourage 'em, as knowing how great a Reward thou wilt receive if thou dost it, and how great a Danger thou wilt incur by neglecting it.

(c) Πάντων φρονεῖτω ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ τῶν μὴ ἡμαρτηκότων, ἵνα μείνωσιν ἀναμάρτητοι, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων, ἵνα μετανοήσωσι. Λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς· Ὁρᾶτε μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἐνδὸς τῶν μικρῶν τέτων. — Ὡς αὖτὲ πλείονων ἀπολογούμεθα, ὡς πάντων φρονεῖτε. καὶ τὰς μὲν ὑμεῖς συνήγετε· τὰς δὲ ἡμαρτηκότας νουθετεῖτε, καὶ σιβῶν ἐν τῇ νηστείᾳ, ἐν τῇ ἀφίσει ἐλάφρυνον, καὶ περισκλεύσαντα εἰσδέχεσθαι, πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς δεόμενης, καὶ χειροθετήσας αὐτὸν, ἵνα λοιπὸν εἶναι ἐν τῇ ποιμνίᾳ. τὰς δὲ ὑπνώδεις καὶ παρεμυδρὰς ἐπιστρέφετε, ὑπενθίζετε, ὡρτάλλετε, διεσπάρτε, ἐπιστάμεθα ὑλίκων μισθὸν ἔχεις ταῦτα ἐπιτελών, ὥσπερ ἐν καὶ κίνδυνον εἶναι ἀμελήσης τέτων.

*Ibid.* cap. 18. See also cap. 20, 25, 26.

(d) Cap. 27. "You Brethren ought to bring your Sacrifices and Oblations to the Bishop as to the High Priest, and offer 'em either by your selves or by the Deacons. Offer him also your First-Fruits, and Tythes, and your voluntary Gifts; for he knows the Poor, and gives to every one what is convenient, least one receive twice or oftner the same Day or the same Week, and another receive not so much as once.

(e) Cap. 28. "They that wou'd invite the ancient Women to an *Agape* (or, as the Lord calls it, a Feast) let 'em send to such as the Deacons know to be poor. But in the Feast, what is wont to be given to the Pastor, (I mean what there is of the First-Fruits,) Let it be laid by, as for the Priest, in Honour of God, from whence he has receiv'd the Priesthood, and as much as is given to every ancient (poor) Wo-

(d) Προσῆκει καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοὶ, τὰς θυσίας ὑμῶν ἢτοι προσφορὰς πρὸ ἐπισκόπου προσφέρειν ὡς ἀρχιερεῖ, ἢ δι' ἑαυτῶν ἢ διὰ τῶν διακόνων· ἢ μὲν ὅ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς, καὶ τὰς δεκάτας, καὶ τὰ ἐκείσα αὐτῷ προσάγει. αὐτὸς γὰρ γνωσκει τὰς θλιβεμένους, καὶ ἐκείῳ δίδωσι πρὸς τὸ ἀρμύζον, ὅπως μὴ δις ἢ πλεονάκις τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἢ τῇ αὐτῇ ἐξ ὁδομαδὶ λαμβάνῃ, ἕτεροῦ ὅ, ἢ ἑτέρου. *Ibid.* cap. 27.

(e) Τοῖς εἰς ἀγάπην, ἢτοι δοχῇ, ὡς ὁ κύριος ἐνὸνμασε, παραινεμένοις καλεῖν πρεσβυτέρους, ὡς ἐπίστανται οἱ διάκονοι θλιβεμένους, αὐτῇ πλεονάκις πεμπέτωσαν. ἀφοριζέτω ὅ, ἐν τῇ δοχῇ, τὸ πρὸ ποιμνίου ἐδίμνον, λέγω ὅ, τὸ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς, ὡς ἱερεῖ, καὶ μὴ παρῇ τῇ δοχῇ, εἰς πηλὴν θεῶν τὴν ἱερραίαν αὐτῷ ἐλχεῖσαν. ὅσον ὅ, ἐκείῃ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δίδοιαι, διπλὴν δίδωτω τοῖς διακόνοις εἰς γέρας χειρὸς. τοῖς δὲ πρεσβυτέροις ὡς ἂν ἡμῶν πειρὸν τὸν τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγον διλωκεῖς, διπλὴ καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀφοριζέτω ἡ μοῖρα εἰς χάριν τῶν τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποστόλων, ὧν καὶ τὸν τόπον φυλάσσουσιν, ὡς σύμβουλοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ ὅ, ἐκκλησίας σέφαντο· εἰσὶ γὰρ συνέδριον καὶ βουλὴ ὅ, ἐκκλησίας. εἰ ὅ, καὶ ἀναγνώσις βιβλίου, λαμβανέτω καὶ αὐτὸς μοῖραν μίαν εἰς πηλὴν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ὡσαύτως καὶ ψαλμοὺς καὶ ψαλμῶν. ἐκείῳ ἔν ἀξιώματι οἱ λαϊκοὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν πηλὴν νεμέτωσαν ἐν τοῖς ὁμασι καὶ τῇ κατὰ τὸν εἶον ἐντροπῇ. *Ibid.* cap. 28.



“ man, let twice as much be given to the Deacons  
 “ out of respect to Christ. Let a double Portion also  
 “ be given to the Presbyters, because they Labour in  
 “ Word and Doctrine, for the Sake of the Apostles of  
 “ our Lord, whose Place they hold; as the Counsellors  
 “ of the Bishop and Crown of the Church. And he  
 “ that is the Reader, let him also have one Part for  
 “ the Honour of the Prophets. And in the same  
 “ Manner, the Clark (or *Præcentor*) and the Door-  
 “ keeper. Let therefore the Laity pay a due Vene-  
 “ ration to every Ecclesiastical Dignity in their Gifts,  
 “ and their honourary Supply of the Necessaries of  
 “ Life.

(f) *Cap. 31.* “ The Deacon must give nothing  
 “ to any poor Man, without the Bishops Knowledge  
 “ and Consent.

(g) *Cap. 34.* “ The Laity of the Bishop’s Church  
 “ are requir’d to give him the First-Fruits of their  
 “ Corn, Wine, Oil, Apples, Wool, and whatever else  
 “ God blessed them with.

(h) *Cap. 44.* “ The Deacon must be the Bishop’s  
 “ Eye, and Ear and Mouth, nay his Heart and Soul,  
 “ that the Bishop may be only taken up with the  
 “ weightier Affairs of his Flock.

(f) Μὴδὲν ποιεῖτω τὸ σύνολον [ὁ διάκονος] ἀνδρὶ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ,  
 μὴδὲ πνὶ διδῶτω π ἀνδρὶ τῷ ἐκείνῳ γνώμης. *Ibid. cap. 31.*

(g) Ὁφείλειε ——— τὸν ἐπίσκοπον πμᾶν ὡς κύριον, τὰς κἀ-  
 πτες ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν εἰς ἐυλογία τῶν ὑμῶν προσφέρειν  
 ἰες αὐτῷ, τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ὑμῶν, καὶ τὰς δεκάτας ὑμῶν, καὶ τὰ ἀγα-  
 γήματα ὑμῶν, καὶ τὰ δῶρα ὑμῶν διδόντες αὐτῷ ὡς ἱερεὶ Θεῷ, ἀπαρχή  
 σίτε, ὄινυ, ἐλαίῳ, ὀπώρας, ἐρύας, καὶ πάντων ὧν κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιγ-  
 γηγεῖ ὑμῶν. *Ibid. cap. 34.*

(h) Ἐστὼ ὁ διάκονος τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκοή, καὶ ὀφθαλμος, καὶ σῶμα,  
 καρδία τε καὶ ψυχὴ, ἵνα μὴ ᾖ τὰ πολλὰ μεριμνῶν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἀλλὰ  
 μόνον τὰ κυριώτερα. *Ibid. cap. 44.*

(i) *Cap.*

(i) Cap. 54. "When the Bishop was to proceed to Prayer, after reading, and singing and expounding the Scriptures (*the ancient way of Preaching*.) The Deacon standing by him was to proclaim with a loud Voice, let none bear any Grudge against another, let none come in Hypocrisy; that if there be any Discord (or Quarrel) among any, they may thro' remorse of Conscience beg Pardon of God, and be reconcil'd to their Brethren.

(k) Cap. 57. "When thou (*the Bishop*) hast call'd together the Church of God, like the Master of a great Ship,

(i) Ὡς ἐπίσκοποι, μελλόντων ὑμῶν εἰς πρεσβυτέρω ἀπαλῶν, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν καὶ τὴν ψαλμωδίαν, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ ταῖς γραφαῖς διδασκαλίαν, ὁ διάκονος εἰς τὸν πλησίον ὑμῶν, μετὰ ὑψηλῆς φωνῆς λεγέτω μή τις κατὰ πνῶν μή τις ἐν ὑποκρίσει, ἵνα ἐὰν ἐνδοκίμῃ ἐν ποινῇ ἀντιλογία, συνειδήσει κρυπτὰς, δηλώσῃ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ διαλλαγῶσι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. *Ibid.* cap. 54.

(k) Ὅταν συναθροίῃς τὴν τῷ Θεῷ ἐκκλησίαν, ὥς ἂν κυβερνήτης νηὸς μεγάλης, μετ' ἐπισήμης πάσης ἐκείνῃ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς συνόδους, ἀναγγέλλων τοῖς διακόνοις ὥσαντι ναύταις, τὰς τούτους ἐκείνους τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, κατὰ πνῶν ἐπιμελείας καὶ σεμνότητος. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ οἶκος ἔστω ἐπιμελής, κατ' ἀνάλογον τετραμυρῶν, ὅς ἐστιν ἐκείνων τῶν μερῶν τὰ παροφθία πρὸς ἀνάλογον, ὥς ἐοικε νηὶ. Κεῖνται ὅ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ θρόνον παρ' ἐκείνους ὅ αὐτῶν κατεξέδωκε τὸ πρεσβυτέριον, καὶ οἱ διάκονοι παριστάδωνται ἐνσταλαῖς τῷ πλείοντι ἐκείνῳ ἐοικασί γὰρ ναύταις καὶ τοιχάρχοις πρεσβυτέρους καὶ τέκτων εἰς τὸ ἕτερον μέρος οἱ λαϊκοὶ κατεξέδωσαν μετὰ πάσης πονηρίας καὶ ἐπιμελείας καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες κεχωρισμένως καὶ αὐταὶ κατεξέδωσαν. σιωπῶν ἀγασθαι. μετὰ δ' ὁ ἀναγνώστης ἐφ' ὑψηλῆς πνῶν εἰς τὸν ἀναγνωσκέτω τὰ Μωσέως, κ. τ. λ. — Ἀρὰ δύο ὅ γε γενομένων ἀναγνώσμάτων, ἕτερος τις τῶν Δαβὶδ ψαλλέτω ὕμνος, καὶ ὁ λαὸς τὰ ἀκροσίσια ὑποψαλλέτω. μετὰ τούτοις αἱ πρεσβυτεῖαι ἀναγνωσκέδωσαν, καὶ ὁπσομαι, κ. τ. λ. — Καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνώσῃ κόμῳ ἢ τὸ ἀναγγέλιον, πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, καὶ οἱ διάκονοι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σιγήτωσαν μετὰ πολλῆς ἡσυχίας. — Καὶ ἐξῆς ἀναγγέλλωσαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τὸν λαόν, ὁ καθεὶς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ

“ Ship, require ’em to assemble often with all Prudence  
 “ and Regularity of Discipline, commanding the Dea-  
 “ cons as so many Mariners, that they appoint con-  
 “ venient Places to all the Brethren, as so many Pas-  
 “ sengers with all Care and Decency. And first let  
 “ the House (or Place of Meeting) be oblong, turn’d  
 “ towards the East, having on both Sides Pews (*Pasto-*  
 “ *phoria*) towards the East, and like to a Ship. In  
 “ the middle Place the Bishop’s Seat (or Throne) and  
 “ on both Sides let the Presbytery sit. But let the  
 “ Deacons stand ready for Service lightly cloath’d;  
 “ for they are like the Mariners and those that order  
 “ the Sides of the Ship. By their Care, let the Lay-  
 “ men sit quietly and orderly in one Part of the  
 “ Church, but the Women sit apart by themselves  
 “ abstaining from talking. But let the Reader in the

ἀπαιτεῖς· καὶ τελειῶνται πάντων ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ὃς ἔοικε κυβερνήτῃ.  
 συνέτωπαν ὅ οἱ μὲν πλωτοὶ εἰς τὰς εἰσόδους τῶν ἀνδρῶν, φυλάσσον-  
 τες αὐτάς, αἱ δὲ διάκονοι εἰς τὰς τῶν γυναικῶν, δίκην ναυτολόγων.  
 — Εἰ δὲ περὶ εὐρεθῇ ἄλλος τόπος καθεζόμενος, ὅπῃ πλησέσθω  
 ὑπὸ τοῦ διακόνου, ὡς πρῶτος, καὶ εἰς τὸν καθύπευκτα αὐτῷ τόπον  
 μεταγέσθω. ἢ μόνον γὰρ νηὶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάνδρῃ ὁμοίῳ ἢ ἐκκλη-  
 σίᾳ. — Ομοίως ὁ διάκονος ἐπισκοπεῖ τὸν λαὸν ὅπως μή τις  
 ψιθυρίσῃ, ἢ νυγῇ, ἢ γελᾷ, ἢ κλάσῃ. — Μετὰ τὴν κατηχη-  
 σμὸν καὶ τὴν τῶν μελανούλων ἕξασον, — οἱ διάκονοι —  
 οἱ μὲν τῇ πρὸς τὴν εὐχαριστίαν χολαζέτωσαν, ὑπηρετῆμενοι τῷ τοῦ  
 κυρίου σώματι μετὰ φόβου, αἱ δὲ τὰς ὁχλούς διασκηπύτωσαν, καὶ ἡσυχίαν  
 αὐτοῖς ἐμποιήσωσαν. λεγέτω δὲ ὁ παρεστὼς τῷ ἀρχιερεὶ διά-  
 κονος τῷ λαῷ· μή τις κατὰ πνέῃ· μή τις ἐν ὑποκρίσει· εἴτα καὶ  
 ἀσπαζέσθωσαν ἀλλήλους οἱ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἀλλήλους αἱ γυναῖκες. —  
 Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο προσευχέσθω ὁ διάκονος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπάσης.  
 — Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπυχόμενος τῷ λαῷ εὐχί-  
 νην, εὐλογείτω τὸν λαόν. — Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα γινέσθω ἡ θυσία, ἐσώτῃ  
 πάντες τὸ λαόν, καὶ προσευχόμενοι ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἄλλαν ἀνενεχθῇ, μετὰ λα-  
 βανὴν ἐκείνην τάξις κατὰ ἑαυτὴν τοῦ κυριακοῦ σώματος. — Φυ-  
 λαττέτωσαν δὲ αἱ θύραι, μέγας αὖτος εἰσέλθοι, ἢ ἀμύνηται. Ibid.  
 cap. 57.

“ Middle



" Middle standing in some high Place [ *like our Desks* ]  
 " read the Books of *Moses*, &c. The Reading being  
 " finish'd by two (Readers) let another sing the Hymns  
 " of *David*, and the People sing with him the Ends of  
 " the Verses. Then let our Acts (i. e. *those of the*  
 " *Apostles* ) and the Epistles &c. be recited. And  
 " when the Gospel shall be recited, let all the Pres-  
 " byters and Deacons, and the whole People stand  
 " with Silence. After these Things, let the Presbyters  
 " exhort the People, *viz.* some of 'em, not all, and  
 " the Bishop last of all, who is like the Master of the  
 " Ship. But let the Door-keepers stand at the Church  
 " Doors where the Men enter, but the Deaconesses  
 " where the Women enter, like those that receive the  
 " Passage-Money from the Passengers. If any be  
 " found sitting out of his own Place, let the Deacon  
 " reprove him, who is in the Place of the *Proreter*,  
 " and let him be carried to a convenient Place; for  
 " the Church is not only compar'd to a Ship, but to a  
 " Sheepfold, &c. The Deacons were also to take  
 " Care that none whisper'd, slept, laugh'd, nodded, &c.  
 " After the Catechumens and Penitents were gone  
 " out, the Deacons were some of 'em to prepare  
 " Things for the Celebration of the Eucharist, others  
 " to look about and command Silence. The Deacon  
 " that assisted the High-Priest (i. e. *the Bishop* ) was  
 " to cry aloud, let none bear any Grudge against ano-  
 " ther, let none come in Hypocrisy. These Things  
 " being done, the Men were to salute one another, and  
 " so the Women; afterwards the Deacon pray'd for the  
 " whole Church, then the Bishop was to bless the Peo-  
 " ple; thereupon the (Eucharistical) Sacrifice was to be  
 " celebrated, The People standing, and silently pray-  
 " ing; then the Communicants were to approach and  
 " receive the Elements, and the Doors were to be kept  
 " shut that no Infidel or unbaptiz'd Person might enter.

(1) Cap. 58. " If a Brother or Sister comes out of another Parish and bring commendatory Letters, let the Deacons make enquiry concerning 'em whether they be Believers, whether the Sons of the Church, whether they be undefil'd by any Herefy; and concerning a Woman, whether she be married or a Widow; and so their State being known, that they truly believe and agree with the Church of the Lord, let the Deacons lead every one of 'em to a convenient Place. But if a Presbyter come out of another Parish, let him be receiv'd into the Society of the Presbyters. And if a Deacon, let him be received by the Deacons. But if a Bishop, let him sit with the Bishop, from whom he shall have equal respect paid. And thou, O Bishop, shalt desire him to preach to the People; for the Exhortation and Admonition of Strangers is most acceptable and useful; For no Prophet (saith our Lord) has Honour in his own Country. Thou shalt also leave it to his Pleasure, whether he'll celebrate the Eucharist, which if as a wise Man out of Modesty and respect to thee

(1) Εἰ τις ἀπὸ παροικίας ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ ἐπέλθῃ, συστάσαν ἐπισκομοζούμενοι, διάκονοι δὲ ἀπαινεῖτω τὰ κατ' αὐτὲς, ἀνακρίτων εἰς τοὺς, εἰ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ, εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ ἀρεστῆς εἰς μεμολυσμένοι· καὶ παλιν εἰ ὁ πανθρὸς, ἢ χήρα καὶ ἕτω γυνὴ τὰ κατ' αὐτὲς, ὡς εἰσὶν ἀληθῶς πιστοὶ καὶ ὁμογνώμονες ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς, ἀπαγγέτω ἕκαστον εἰς τὸν πρεσβύτερον αὐτῶ τόπον. εἰ δὲ καὶ πρεσβύτερος ἀπὸ παροικίας ἐπέλθῃ, πρεσβερχέτω ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων κοινωνικῶς. εἰ δὲ διάκονος, ὑπὸ τῶν διακόνων· εἰ δὲ ἐπίσκοπος, σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καθιζέτω, ὃ αὐτῆς ἀξιόμηνος ὑπ' αὐτῆς πμῆς καὶ ἐρωτήσεως αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐπίσκοπος, πρεσβερχέτω τῷ λαῷ λόγους διδακτικὰς· ἢ γὰρ τῶν ξένων ἐρῶμενοι καὶ νεοεισάκουσιν παρὰ τὸν καὶ ὁφελιμωτέτη σφόδρα. Οὐδεὶς γὰρ πρεσβυτέρου, φκπὴν, δεκτὸς ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ παλιν. Ἐπὶ τρέφει δὲ αὐτῶ καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἀνοῖσαι· εἰ δὲ δὲ εὐλαβείαν, ὡς σφόδρα, τὴν πμῆν σοι πηρῶν, μὴ θελήσῃ ἀνενέσκει, καὶ εἰς τὸν λαὸν εὐλογίαν αὐτὸν ποιῶσαι· καὶ ἀναγκάσει· Ibid. cap. 58.

" he

“ he shall refuse, thou shalt at least oblige him to  
 “ bless the People. The rest of the Chapter advises  
 the Bishop, if a Gentleman, that is a Stranger, come  
 in, not to leave his Seat, or interrupt his Discourse  
 out of respect to him, but the Deacon is order'd to  
 provide him a Seat.

(m) *Cap. 59.* “ When thou teacheft, O Bishop,  
 “ command and perswade the People, that they fre-  
 “ quent the Church every Day Morning and Evening,  
 “ and that none omit, but daily meet, that none by  
 “ withdrawing himself rob the Church of a Member,  
 “ and make the Body of Christ lame (or defective.)  
 “ For 'tis not only said of Priests, but every Layman  
 “ shou'd hear and consider what our Lord saith as spoken  
 “ of himself, he that is not with me is against me,  
 “ and he that gathers not with me scattereth, &c.

(n) *Lib. VIII. Cap. 4.* “ First of all, I Peter say,  
 “ That a Bishop is to be ordain'd blameless in all  
 “ Things

(m) Διδάσκων δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, κέλευε καὶ παραίνει τὸ λαὸν, εἰς  
 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐνδελέχῃζεν ὅρδρε καὶ ἐσπέρας ἐκάστης ἡμέρας, καὶ μὴ  
 ὑπολειπεῖται τὸ σύνολον, ἀλλὰ συνέρχεται διηνεκῶς, καὶ μήτε τιμὴν  
 ἐκκλησίαν κολεῖν ἐαυτὸν ὑφαιρῶντα, καὶ ὅθεν μέλθῃ ποιῶν τὸ σῶ-  
 μα τῆς χριστοῦ· ἐ γὰρ μόνον οὕτως ἱερέων ἐρρέθη. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕκαστος τῶν  
 λαϊκῶν οὕτως ἀκκέτω, λογιζόμενος ὅτι εἶρηται ὑπὸ τῆς κυρίας· Ὁ  
 μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμῶν, κατ' ἐμῶν ἔστι, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμῶν, σκορπί-  
 ζει. *Ibid. cap. 59.*

(n) Πρῶτος ἐν ἐγὼ φημι Πέτρος, ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονεῖσθαι —  
 ἐν πᾶσιν ἀμεμπτον, ἀριστίνδην ὑπὸ παντὸς τῆς λαοῦ ἐκκληλεγματόν.  
 ἔδογμαδένθῃ καὶ ἀρέσανθῃ, συνελθὼν ὁ λαὸς ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ  
 καὶ τοῖς παρῶν ἐπισκόποις, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κυριακῇ, συνάδουκίτω. ὁ δὲ  
 πρεσβυτερίῳ τῶν λοιπῶν, ἐρωτάτω πρεσβυτερίον καὶ τὸν λαόν,  
 εἰ αὐτὸς ὅστις, ὅν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐπινδύσαντων, πρεσε-  
 περωιάτω. εἰ μαρτυρεῖται ὑπὸ πάντων ἀξιῶ εἶναι τῆς μεγάλης ταύ-  
 τος καὶ λαμπρῆς ἡγεμονίας, εἰ τὰ κατὰ τὴν εἰς Θεὸν αὐτῷ εὐσέβειαν  
 κατῳρῶνται, εἰ τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους δίκαια πεφύλακται, εἰ τὰ κατὰ  
 τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ καλῶς ὠκονόμηται, εἰ τὰ κατὰ τὸν εἶον ἀνεπλήτως,  
 καὶ



“ Things, and chosen as the most Excellent by all the  
 “ People ; who being nam'd and approv'd, let the  
 “ People being gather'd on the Lord's-Day together  
 “ with the Presbytery and the Bishops that are present  
 “ give their Consent. And he that is the Chief a-  
 “ mong the rest (i. e. *the Bishops*) let him ask the  
 “ Presbytery and the People, whether this be he  
 “ whom they require for their *Præses* (or Pastor;) If  
 “ they assent, let him again ask if he have a Testimo-  
 “ ny from all, that he is worthy of this great and il-  
 “ lustrious Presidency, Whether he practices what-  
 “ ever relates to Piety towards God and Justice towards  
 “ Men, whether his Domestical Affairs be rightly  
 “ manag'd, whether his Life be led in an irreprehen-  
 “ sible manner. And when all in like Manner shall  
 “ testify according to Truth, and not according to  
 “ their prejudicate Opinion, That he is such a One,  
 “ and this as in the Presence of God and Christ, and  
 “ the Holy Spirit, and all the Holy Ministering Spirits,  
 “ (*The Angels*) Let a Third Enquiry be made, Whether  
 “ he be worthy of the Ministry, that every Word may  
 “ be establish'd in the Mouth of two or three Wit-  
 “ nesses. And they a Third Time assenting that he  
 “ is worthy, let every one be requir'd to give a Sign  
 “ of his Consent, and let them that give it chearfully

καὶ πάντων ἁμα καὶ ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλ' ἔκαστος ἀπέληξεν μαρτυροῦντων  
 τοῖς τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, ὡς ἐπὶ δικαστῇ Θεῷ καὶ χριστῷ, παρόντι δὲ διχα-  
 δὴ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων καὶ λειτουργικῶν πνεύ-  
 μάτων, ἐν τρίτῳ πάλιν πυθέσθαι, εἰ ἄξιός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς τῆς λει-  
 τουργίας ἵνα ἐπὶ σέματι δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων σταθῇ πᾶν ῥῆμα. καὶ  
 συνθημάτων αὐτῶν ἐκ τρίτου ἄξιον εἶναι, ἀπαλείδωσαν οἱ πάντες σύν-  
 δημα καὶ δόσεις προθύμως, ἀκούσων καὶ σιωπῆς γενόμενης εἰς  
 τῶν πρώτων ἐπισκόπων ἁμα καὶ δυσὶν ἑτέροις, πλησίον τῷ δυσπασχεῖν  
 ἐσῶς, τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων σιωπῇ προσευχαζόντων,  
 τῶν δὲ διακόνων τὰ δεῖα εὐαγγέλια ἐπὶ τῷ τῷ χειροτονουμένῳ κεφαλῇ  
 ἀνεπιγυμνά κατεχόντων, λέγεται πρὸς Θεον. — *Constit. Apo-*  
*stol. Lib. VII. cap. 4.*

“ be

“ be heard. Let one of the chief Bishops standing  
 “ near the Altar with two others, (the rest of the Bi-  
 “ shops and Presbyters silently praying, and the Dea-  
 “ cons holding open the Divine Gospels over the Head  
 “ of him that is ordain’d) say to God. [*There follows*  
*the Prayer.*]

(o) *Cap. 30.* “ I enjoyn, That all the First-Fruits  
 “ be brought to the Bishop and Presbyters, and Dea-  
 “ cons for their Sustenance, and that all the Tythes be  
 “ offer’d for maintaining the rest of the Clergy, (*such*  
 “ *as the Reader, Præcentor, Subdeacons, &c.*) the Vir-  
 “ gins and Widows, and the Poor. For the First-  
 “ Fruits belong to the Priests and the Deacons that  
 “ minister to them.

(p) *Cap. 31.* “ I appoint the same concerning what is  
 “ left [of the Bread and Wine after the Eucharist]  
 “ let the Deacons distribute the *Eulogia* that remain of  
 “ the mystical Oblations to the Clergy, Four Parts to  
 “ the Bishop, Three Parts to a Presbyter, Two to  
 “ a Deacon; but to the rest, (The Subdeacons or Rea-  
 “ der, or *Præcentors*, or Deaconesses) one Part.

(o) Προσάσω πᾶσαν ἀπαρχὴν προσκομίζεσθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ  
 καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ τοῖς διακόνοις, εἰς διατροφήν αὐτῶν πᾶσαν δὲ  
 δεκάτην προσφέρεσθαι, εἰς διατροφήν τῶν λοιπῶν κληρικῶν, καὶ τῶν  
 παρθένων, καὶ τῶν χηρῶν, καὶ τῶν, ἐν πενίᾳ ἐξέλεσθαι. αἱ γὰρ  
 ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν ἱερέων εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐξυπηρεσιμένων διακόνων.  
*Ibid. cap. 30.*

(p) Ὁ αὐτὸς περὶ περιουμάτων διάλειψαι· τὰς περιουσίας  
 ἐν τοῖς μυστικοῖς εὐλογίαις, κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἢ τῶν πρεσβυ-  
 τέρων οἱ διάκονοι διανεμέτωσαν τῷ κλήρῳ· τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ μέρος τέσσα-  
 ρα, πρεσβυτέρῳ μέρος τρία, διακόνῳ μέρος δύο· τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις ὑπο-  
 διακόνοις ἢ ἀναγνώταις, ἢ ψάλταις, ἢ διακονίσσαις, μέρος ἓν.  
*Ibid. 31.*

*Apostolical Canons.*

(a) "Can. 2. enjoyns, That nothing be offer'd at the Altar but Oyl and Incense. But all other Fruits were to be sent Home, and not to the Altar, for the Bishop and Presbyters; for they were to distribute 'em to the Deacons and other Clergy,

(b) Can. 6th. "Orders the Excommunication of a Bishop or Presbyter, or Deacon, that neglects to communicate when the Eucharist is celebrated.

(c) Can. 7th. "Orders the same concerning the Faithful, or Members of the Bishop's Church.

(d) Can. 11th. "Forbids a Bishop to go out of his Parish to invade another Man's. And Can. 12th. "Forbids the same to a Presbyter or other Clergyman.

(e) Can. 23. "If any Bishop obtain a Church by

(a) Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ᾧ τινὶ ὑπὸ κυρίου διάταξιν τινὶ ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ, προσενέγκῃ ἑτέρα πνα ἐπὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ θυσιαστήριον, ἢ γάλα, κ. τ. λ. Καταριζέσθω. — μὴ ἔξδὸν ἔστω προσάγεσθαι π — πλὴν ἑλαιον εἰς τινὶ ἁγίαν λυχνίαν, καὶ θυμίαμα. ἢ δὲ ἄλλη πᾶσα ὁπωρὰ εἰς οἶκον ἀπεστέλλεσθαι ἀπαργὴ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον. ὁ δὲ ἄλλος, ὡς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπιμαρτυροῦσι καὶ τοῖς διακόνοις, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς κληρικοῖς. Canon Apostol. 2.

(b) Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ἐκ τῶν καὶ ἀλόγου τῶν ἱερῶν, πρὸς πορνεύσας γενόμενης, μὴ μετὰ ἀλλοίᾳ, τὴν εἰπάτω καὶ εἰς εὐλογίας ἢ, συγγνώμης τυγχάνετω εἰ δὲ λέγῃ, ἀφορίζεσθαι. Can. 6.

(c) Πανίας τὰς εἰσόδους πρὸς — μὴ παραμένοντας τῇ προσυχῇ καὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ μετὰ ἀλλοίᾳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι χρή. Can. 7.

(d) Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ ἔξῃναι καὶ ἀλλοίᾳ τινὶ ἑαυτοῦ παροικίαν, ἑτέρα ὁποῦ δ' αὖν. Can. 11. Εἰ τις πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τῶν καὶ ἀλόγου τῶν κληρικῶν, ἀπολείψας τινὶ ἑαυτοῦ παροικίαν, εἰς ἑτέραν ἀπέλθῃ, — τὸν κελύομεν μὴ κέπ λειβεργεῖν, κ. τ. λ. Can. 12.

(e) Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος κοσμητοῖς ἄρχεσι χρησάμενος, δι' αὐτῶν ἐγκρατὴς ἐκκλησίας γένῃται, καταριζέσθω, καὶ ἀφορίζεσθαι, καὶ οἱ κοινῶν ἄνθρωποι πάντες. Can. 23.

" the



“ the Interest of secular Princes (or Rulers) let him be  
 “ depos’d and excommunicated, and all that commu-  
 “ nicate with him.

(f) *Can. 24.* “ If any Presbyter despising his own  
 “ Bishop shall set up a Congregation apart, and set  
 “ up another Altar ( or Communion-Table, ) when  
 “ he cannot justly condemn his Bishop for any Defect  
 “ of Piety or Justice, let him be depos’d as one desi-  
 “ rous of Domination, &c. See also *Can. 27, 28.*

(g) *Can. 32.* “ Let the Presbyters and Deacons do  
 “ nothing without the Judgment and Will of the Bi-  
 “ shop; for ’tis he to whom the People of the Lord is  
 “ entrusted, and of whom an Account of their Souls  
 “ will be requir’d.

(h) *Can. 50.* “ If a Bishop or Presbyter neglect the  
 “ Clergy or the People, and teach ’em not Piety, let  
 “ him be excommunicated; and if he continue slothful,  
 “ let him be depos’d.

I have been the more large in reciting these *Passages*,  
 that I may if possible convince Mr. Dr—— himself,  
 that what he takes to be the greatest *Paradox* in Na-  
 ture, is capable of as clear Proof as it is almost possi-  
 ble for a Matter of Fact to admit of, *viz.* That the Bi-  
 shop mention’d in these Constitutions, as well as other  
 Writers of the two or three First Ages was a *Congrega-*  
*tional* or *Parochial*, not a *Diocesan Bishop*.

(f) Εἰ τις πρεσβύτερος ἀπαφρονέσας τὸ ἴδιον ἐπισκόπου, χωρὶς  
 συναγάγῃ, καὶ δυσιασήμερον ἕτερον πῆξῃ, μηδὲν καλεσθῆναι τὸ ἐπι-  
 σκόπου ἐν ἐκείνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, καθαιρεῖται ὡς εἰλαρχος. *Can. 24.*

(g) Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διάκονοι ἀνά γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μη-  
 δὲν ἐπιτελείωσαν· ἀλλ’ ὅς γ’ ἔστιν ὁ πεποιημένος τὸν λαὸν τὸ κυεῖν,  
 καὶ τὸν ἕκαστον τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λόγον ἀπαμνηστέμενον. *Can. 32.*

(h) Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἀμελῶν τὰ κλήρα, ἢ τὰ λαὸν,  
 καὶ μὴ παιδεύων αὐτοὺς τὴν εὐσέβειαν, ἀφορίζεται· ἐπιμένων δὲ τῇ  
 φανερῇ, καθαιρεῖται. *Can. 50.*

'Tis manifest, That if we apply all these Passages to a *Parochial Bishop* that has only one *Communion-Table* for his whole Church, there is not only no Force offer'd to 'em, but every Thing in 'em is easy and plain, intelligible and accountable. But if we apply 'em to a *Diocesan Bishop* and a *Diocesan Church*, there is such an Heap of *Contradictions* and utter *Impossibilities* that no Man can digest, whose Throat is not wide enough to swallow *Transubstantiation* it self.

Thus as to *Constit. Apost. Cap. 10. & 16 & 18.* That all the People of a Parish may meet in one Church, that they may all behold the Tears of a penitent Offender, that the whole Church may intercede for him to their *Parochial Bishop* or *Pastor*, is very intelligible: But how all the People of a *Diocese* shou'd meet, how they shou'd all be Witnesses of the Penitents Tears, how they shou'd all joyn to intercede with their *Diocesan* in his behalf, will require Mr. Dr——'s Skill to explain. And he will find it much harder to explain, how a *Diocesan Bishop* can possibly take such a particular Care of the Souls of all that belong to his *Diocesan Church*, as the *Bishop* is there requir'd to do of all in his Flock. I am very sure, it will require the utmost Diligence of a *Parochial Pastor* to do it for all within the Bounds of his Parish, if his Congregation be numerous.

For *Cap. 27.* Besides the great Difficulty that most of the *Diocese* will find, in carrying their *Tythes* and *First-Fruits*, and other Offerings to the *Diocesan Bishop's* House; how he shou'd be able to take such a particular Care of all the Poor of the *Diocese*, as to see, That some receive not twice or oftner the same Day, or the same Week, while others may receive nothing, is a Task which we despair of being able to account for.

What then shall we think of *Cap. 28.* if we apply it to the *Diocesan Bishop*, to all his Clergy, and the poor old Women of his *Diocese*? That rich Member of the Congregation must have the Purse of a Prince, and have a Palace as large as that of *Abasuerus*, that can provide either Entertainment or Rooms enough for such a Number

ber o  
Bisho  
and  
Dioc  
they  
van  
and  
it m  
liber  
Be  
one  
serve  
Fo  
How  
of th  
Occa  
the  
build  
Corn  
from  
Tyth  
recei  
Fo  
Mr.  
rope,  
Clerg  
Dioc  
'em  
Sacr  
bilit  
than  
yet  
Lora  
appl  
ters  
T  
59.  
the  
Deac

ber of *Guests*, and can assign so large a Portion to the *Bishop*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, nay *Subdeacons*, *Clerks* and *Door-keepers* that belong to every *Congregation* in the *Diocess*; and 'tis well if his Provisions be sweet when they must be carried so far. But all these Difficulties vanish when we understand it of the *Parochial Bishop*, and the *Clergy*, and poor *Widows* of the *Parish*. And it must be no *parsimonious Feast*, that provides such a liberal Allowance for every one of them.

Besides, when there is but one *Reader* or *two*, and one *Door-keeper* mention'd, How shou'd each of 'em serve some *Scores* or *Hundreds* of *Congregations* at once?

For *Cap. 31, 34*. Let Mr. Dr—— explain to us, How the *Deacon* shou'd be able to supply all the *Poor* of the *Diocess*, or to consult the *Bishop* on every such Occasion. And sure the *Diocesan Bishop* had need with the *rich Man* in the Gospel, *pull down his Barns and build greater*, if he was to receive the *First-Fruits* of *Corn*, *Wine*, *Oil*, *Apples*, *Wool*, and all other *Tythes* from every Christian House-keeper of his *Diocess*. The *Tythes* and other *Gifts* of a good *Parish*, are very easily receiv'd and laid up.

For *Cap. 54, 57*. We shou'd be much oblig'd to Mr. Dr—— if he wou'd shew us any *Cathedral* in *Europe*, that will hold the *Bishop* of the *Diocess*, all the *Clergy*, and all the *Men*, *Women*, *Boys* and *Girls* of the *Diocess*; any *Reader* or *Preacher* that can be heard by 'em all, or any *Man* that can in one Day administer the *Sacrament* to 'em all. These appear to us utter *Impossibilities*, and no more reconcileable to *Sense* and *Reason*, than the wildest *Absurdities* of *Transubstantiation*; and yet this is the Account of their ordinary *Worship* every *Lord's-Day*. But there is no Difficulty in all this, when apply'd to the *Parochial Bishop* and his *Assistant-Presbyters* and *Deacons*.

The same *Observation* is equally applicable to *Cap. 58, 59*. We constantly find in all their Religious Assemblies, the *Presbyters* sitting together with the *Bishop*, and the *Deacons* standing by him in the same *Church* (or Place  
of



of Assembly). How cou'd this be, when the *Presbyters* of the *Diocess* had their several *subordinate Congregations* to attend and minister to? Must all these *Congregations* be left destitute every *Sunday*, while they attended the *Diocesan Bishop* in his *Cathedral*? Or can Mr. Dr—— shew us any other *Presbyters* that were under the *Bishop's* Government, and attended *other Congregations* in his *Diocess*, besides these that constantly sat with the *Bishop* in his *Cathedral*? Nay, how can the *Diocesan Bishop* exhort all in his Church, to attend his Cathedral every *Morning and Evening*, or complain of their maiming his Church by their *Absence*, when his Cathedral will hold scarce the *Hundredth*, or perhaps the *Thousandth* Part of his *Diocess*? But all this is very intelligible and practicable in Reference to a *Parish-Church*.

Again, If we look to *Const. Apost. Lib. VIII. Cap. 4.* that gives an Account of the *Bishops Ordination*, there is nothing more intelligible and more consistent with Reason, than that all the Members of the *Bishop's Church* shou'd be present at his *Ordination*, bear their *Testimony* concerning his *Abilities* and his *Conversation*, and even the *Management* of his *Domestick Affairs*, and shou'd before his *Ordainers* declare their *Election* and *Approbation* of him, and their *Consent* to his *Pastoral-Presidency* over 'em. But how a *whole Diocess* shou'd meet in *one Church*, (when there is none that will hold perhaps the *Thousandth* Part of 'em?) How they shou'd by any *Sign* declare their *Joint-Approbation*? How shou'd they be able to testify of the *Life* of a Man, that perhaps one in a *Thousand* of 'em never heard of, or at least never knew before? These are all such palpable *Impossibilities*, that they stare every Man in the Face, and make it evident to Demonstration, that these *Constitutions* speak of the *Ordination* of a *Parochial*, and not of a *Diocesan Bishop*. And therefore, 'tis not unpleasant to hear Bishop *Fell* in his *Notes* on the *Oxford Edition* of the *Epistle of Clemens*, draw a *Parallel* between

this

this *Election* of the *ancient Bishops* and the *Election* of our *present Diocesans*.

He takes Notice of that Passage in *Clement*, which mentions *Bishops* being constituted [*οὐδὲ δόκησις ἢ ἐκλογὴ κρίσις*] without the *Approbation* and *Consent* of the whole Church. And to illustrate this, he cites a Passage of *Origen*, That in the *Ordination* of a *Priest*, the *Presence* of the *People* is requir'd, that all may know and be sure, that he who is most *Excellent*, most *learned*, most *holy*, and most *eminent* in all *Vertues*, is chosen to the *Priesthood*; and this is done all the *People* standing by, that no *Retraction*, no *Scruple* may afterwards remain with any one. And (saith he) "The like is done in constituting our *Bishops*, for tho' the *Nomination* be in the Prince, yet the *Election* belongs to the *Presbytery* or the *Chapter* of the *Episcopal See* after the ancient Custom of *Alexandria*. But here there are no less than *Three or Four Remarkable Disparities*: For as to the *Prince's Nomination*, The 24th *Apostolical Canon* orders, "Every such *Bishop* as obtains a *Church* by the Interest of *secular Princes*, to be depos'd and excommunicated, and all that communicate with him to be excommunicated too." And if this *Canon* be of any Force, what shall the poor *People* of the *Diocess* do in this Dispute between the *Prince* and the *Church*, when they must either incur the *Prince's Displeasure* for opposing his *Nomination*, or incur the highest *Censure* of the *Church* for complying with it? This, those wou'd do well to consider, who so much cry up the *Authority* of these *Apostolical Constitutions* in other Matters. The next Disparity is, That the *Election* belong'd to the *People* in the *Primitive Church*; 'tis now transferr'd on the *Dean* and *Chapter*. Nor will the Example of the *Church* of *Alexandria* justify this; for there all the *Presbyters* concurr'd in the *Election*, (and that in *Conjunction* with all the *People*, or else they receded from the Practice of all other Churches, for *Cyprian* expressly tells us, The *People* had the chief Power of choosing worthy *Priests*, and refusing unworthy ones :) But here the *Election* is confin'd to the

Dean and Chapter, all the rest of the Clergy of the Dioceses, who are much the *major* Part of the Clergy being excluded. And I may add, that here the Dean and Chapter's Election is only *Matter of Form*, whereas the *real Power of Electing* then belong'd to the People.

Bishop Fell goes on, "The Election being over, the Assent of the People is expected; for which End (saith he) the Election being made by the Presbytery, is by them solemnly declar'd to the whole People in the Body of the Cathedral Church, who generally accept and ratify it. And in that Instrument whereby the King or Queen's Majesty is certify'd concerning the Tenor of the Election; the Approbation and Applause of the Clergy and the People, to whom the Electors gave Notice of the Election is always mention'd. And the Royal Assent being given to the Election, a Mandate issues from the King to the Metropolitan, that he proceed to confirm the Election. The Metropolitan issues peremptory Citations to all that think themselves concern'd to appear before him or his Vicar-General, at such a Day, Hour and Place, to shew Cause if they can, against the Form of the Election, or the Person elected. The Proctor for the Chapter appears in Court, exhibits a summary Petition setting forth the Abilities, Probity, &c. of the Bishop Elect, and his Fitness to supply that widowed Diocesan Church. The Metropolitan or his Vicar-General does not admit of this Petition, or the Proofs of it, till he has caus'd all Opposers to be summon'd to appear at such a Place, and on such a Day and Hour, and none appearing, (which does not always happen) has pronounc'd 'em contumacious. And yet the Opposers are not by the definitive Sentence for Confirmation of the Elect, precluded from objecting against the Person Elect, or the Form of Election, till they are summon'd again; and they may by Virtue of the first Citation, oppose the Confirmation before the Sentence be pass'd. So that by our

" Law

" Law  
" but  
" exp  
" Tis  
this M  
in Ref  
Paralle  
ly to t  
stolical  
Wha  
Dean a  
is not  
that an  
a Min  
their L  
Elect,  
a Lega  
nifies t  
whole  
no mo  
transac  
Summo  
Election  
Thousan  
or if t  
Trouble  
pose?  
ther, h  
mony c  
nagemen  
And c  
any Co  
Church,  
Elect w  
their T  
Elect w  
quaint  
where t  
Words



“ Law, not only the Laiety’s Approbation is requir’d,  
 “ but their Opposition (if there be any Cause for it) is  
 “ expected, and judicially follicited.

’Tis strange that that learned *Author* shou’d imagine  
 this Method us’d by the *Metropolitan* or *Vicar-General*  
 in Reference to our *Diocesan Bishops*, to be any way  
*Parallel* to that of the *Primitive Church*, and particular-  
 ly to that which is suggested in *St. Clemens* or the *Apo-*  
*stolical Constitutions*.

What signifies the *Publication* of the *Election* of the  
*Dean* and *Chapter* in the *Cathedral-Church*, when there  
 is not one in some *Hundreds* or *Thousands* of the *Diocess*  
 that are *present*, or indeed cou’d find room, if they had  
 a Mind to be so? And if any are *present*, what wou’d  
 their *Dissent* signify to obstruct the *Confirmation* of the  
*Elect*, unless they have a Mind to be at the Charge of  
 a *Legal Process* against the *Bishop Elect*? Or what sig-  
 nifies the *Consent* of *those present* to the *Consent* of the  
*whole Diocess*, when the far greatest Part of ’em are  
 no more acquainted with the Matter, than if it were  
 transacted in another Kingdom? And what signifies a  
*Summons* to all *Opposers* to object against the *Form* of  
*Election*, or *Person* of the *Elect*, when not one of some  
*Thousands* of the *Diocess* hears of any such *Summons*,  
 or if they had any Thing to *Object*, wou’d be at the  
*Trouble* and *Charge* of a *Legal Process* to so little Pur-  
 pose? And cou’d the *whole Diocess* be summon’d toge-  
 ther, how few of ’em cou’d be able to give any Testi-  
 mony concerning the *Learning* or *Piety*, or due Ma-  
 nagement of the *Domestical Affairs* of the *Bishop Elect*?  
 And can any Man whose Judgment is unbiass’d, see  
 any *Conformity* in this to the Practice of the *Primitive*  
*Church*, where the *whole Flock* over which the *Bishop*  
*Elect* was to *preside* were assembled together, where  
 their *Testimony* to the *Abilities* and *Life* of the *Bishop*  
*Elect* was requir’d, where they were suppos’d to be ac-  
 quainted with the *Management* of his *Domestical Affairs*,  
 where they were all *present* to declare by *sensible Signs*  
 (*Words* or *Actions*) their *Approbation* of him and *Con-*

sent to his Pastoral Presidency over 'em, where the Dissent of the Majority wou'd have been an effectual Bar to his Election; where there was no room left for any to complain afterwards that their Assent was not requir'd, or that their Dissent was not regarded. All these Circumstances plainly demonstrate, that it was a Parochial Bishop, and not a Diocesan one, whose Ordination is describ'd in these Apostolical Constitutions, and in other Writers of the Three First Centuries.

And the few Apostolical Canons I have cited, are as undeniable Evidence of the Primitive Bishop being a Parochial one.

By the 2d, We see that the Bishop and Presbyters liv'd together; by the 6th and 7th and 11th, that they were Communicants together in the same Parochial Church; by the 25th, that the Schism of a Presbyter lay in setting up a Congregation apart from his Bishop, or setting up another Altar or Communion-Table, when he had nothing justly to object against the Conduct of his Bishop. Had it been a Diocesan Bishop, how absurd must these Canons be, when the Presbyters had their several Congregations apart from the Bishop's, and in those Churches their Altars or Communion-Tables distinct from his? Whereas these Canons are plain and reasonable, if we suppose the Bishop to be himself the Rector of the Parochial Church that had but one Communion-Table belonging to it. For in that Case, for a Presbyter or Curate to set up a distinct Congregation with its distinct Communion-Table, when he had no reasonable Objection against the Bishop or Rector's Conduct, was truly culpable Schism. If any pretend that it was the setting up of a Cathedral-Altar, and erecting another Diocesan Church that is here meant, They shou'd bring us some Proof from the Monuments of the Three First Centuries, that there was ordinarily in every Bishop's Church not only a Cathedral Altar, but several Parochial Altars subordinate to it. And then their Objection shall be consider'd. But by what we have observ'd already, we may justly despair

of such a thing being possible.

of see  
Altar

An

good

made

and h

has an

Charg

'tis no

Hund

of Bi

an A

Know

be acc

Hund

rochia

Parish

truly

think

diffic

Head

have

and a

Up

Consti

shall

clear

I d

forbi

the I

But

tions

a gro

those

reck

lidity

Const

null,

natio

of seeing any Proof for these (imaginary) *subordinate Altars*.

And indeed the 32d Canon shou'd with wise and good Men end the Dispute; for if all the People that made up the Bishop's Church, be *entrust'd by God to him*, and he *must give an Account of their Souls*; who that has any Regard to his own Soul, wou'd undertake the Charge of as many Souls as a *Diocefs* contains, when 'tis not possible for him to know *one* of them in some Hundreds or Thousands? 'Tis a very weighty Remark of Bishop Taylors, I am sure (saith he) *we cannot give an Account of Souls of which we have no Notice (or Knowledge) (Pref. to Treat. of Rep.)* Who then wou'd be accountable for so many, as he can never know the Hundredth or Thousandth Part of? But how a *Parochial Bishop* shou'd be accountable for the Souls of his *Parishioners*, we can more easily comprehend. And truly he that duly considers the Worth of Souls, will think the due Care of all in a *numerous Parish*, a most difficult and laborious Work, enough to employ his *Head and Heart*, his *Strength and Time*, even tho' he have *Assistants* to help him in the Discharge of so great and awful a Trust.

Upon the whole, If the Bishop mention'd in those *Constitutions*, was any other than a *Parochial Bishop*, I shall utterly despair of Understanding the Sense of the clearest and plainest Expressions.

I do indeed freely own, That *Ordination* seems to be forbid to *Presbyters (or Curates)* and appropriated to the *Bishop or Parish-Rector*, by *Constit. Lib. 8. Cap. 18*. But as that *Constitution* no way concerns the *Ordinations* in the *Dissenting Churches*, which are perform'd by a greater Number of such *Congregational Bishops* than those *Constitutions* require: (for Three such *Bishops* are reckon'd a sufficient Number by *Cap. 27*.) So if the *Validity* of all *Ordinations* must be measur'd by those *Constitutions*, all those *Ordinations* must be accounted null, where the *Prince or secular Rulers* have the *Nomination* of the *Bishop*, since *Canon 24th* (as I observ'd)



orders every such Bishop to be Depos'd and Excommunicated, and all to be Excommunicated that communicate with him. How strange a Degree of Prejudice and Partiality does it then argue, to make Use of one of these Canons to nullify all Ordinations in the Reformed Churches that are not under *Diocesan Episcopacy*, when they are really perform'd by such Bishops as these Canons describe? And to lay no Stress on the other Canon, that (if it be of any Force) *deposes* almost all the *Diocesan Bishops* thro' the Christian World, and excludes all out of the Christian Church that are in Communion with 'em?

I shall not concern my self at all in the Dispute between the learned Bishop Pearson and Bishop Beveridge on the one Hand, and Messieurs Daille and Larroque on the other, concerning the *Antiquity* of these *Apostolical Constitutions* and *Canons*. Daille thinks they were not publish'd till towards the End of the *Fifth Century*. See his *Proem. Codex. Can. & Lib. 1. Sect. 3, 4*. Bishop Beveridge very justly rejects Turrian (the Jesuit's) Opinion, of their being compos'd by the *Apostles* and publish'd by *Clemens Romanus*, and he contends for no higher Date of 'em than the *Second or Third Century*. Blondell supposes they might be published about *A.D. 280*. 'Tis sufficient to my Purpose, that whenever they were publish'd, the Compiler knew of no other than that *Parochial Episcopacy* which is inconsistent with *Diocesan*. Only the lower the Date of those *Canons* is fix'd, it still more clearly demonstrates, That the *Parochial Episcopacy* was long maintain'd in the Church, and *Diocesan Episcopacy* utterly unknown in it. And indeed since those *Constitutions* and *Canons* never once mention those *Congregations* that were in the *Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, set up in some of the bigger Cities under the Bishop's Church, as *Oratories* or *Chappels of Ease* to a large *Parish-Church*, (there being still but one *Altar* or *Communion-Table* for all to communicate at) I am inclinable to think, they might be publish'd towards the end of the *Third* or beginning

of the *Fourth Century*. But how uncertain soever their *Author* may be, and how disputable soever their *Authority*, they afford a clear and irrefragable Testimony to the main Position I produce 'em to prove, That *Parochial Episcopacy* was then the general *Practice* of the *Christian Church*; and that the *Bishop's Church* did not ordinarily exceed the Bounds of a *numerous Congregation*. And that is sufficient to overturn all Arguments that can be drawn from 'em, either for the *Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy*, or for the *Conformity* of that *Form of Government* to the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church* in the Three First Centuries. And if the Evidence I have already produc'd from 'em to clear this important Truth were not abundantly sufficient, any one that reads 'em with an impartial Judgment may be furnish'd with much more.

I shall only add, That tho' the *Author* or *Compiler* of these *Constitutions* and *Canons* be unknown; And tho' 'tis probable that 'tis a *Work* to which gradual Additions have been made; yet the most learned *Antiquaries* do allow, That it does give a true Account of the general State of the *Christian Churches* in the Time when it was compil'd. The learned *Albaspincens* saith of these *Constitutions*. *Observ. lib. 1. p. 38. De Constitutionibus istis nemini dubium esse potest quin probus juxta & antiquus liber sit, certoque affirmare possum trecentis primis, eo Ecclesiam Græcam tanquam Rituali & Pontificali usam fuisse. Quique eas attente legerit, eadem de illis quæ de Canonibus judicabit, additas, viz. decursu temporum primis novas, quemadmodum & nova leges & constitutiones in Regimine Ecclesiæ novis occasionibus enatis factæ sunt.* To his Testimony I shall add that of the judicious *Dr. Barrow*, who calls the *Apostolical Constitutions*, a very ancient Book, that sets forth the most ancient Traditions of the Church. And again, They describe the State of the Church, it's Customs and Practice current in the Time of the Compiler. I might cite *Du Pin* and *Dr. Beveridge* to the same Purpose. And I mention these Testimonies to obviate *Dr. Maurice's* Exception against the

Use here made of these *Constitutions* and *Canons*. For he to avoid the clear Evidence they offer for *Episcopal* Churches being then only *Congregational* ones, tells us, *The Author was a Cheat and deserves no Credit*. 'Tis true indeed; The *Compiler* has borrow'd the Name of the *Apostles* to give the greater Authority to these *Constitutions*. But if *Episcopal* Churches were in his Time generally *Diocesan* not *Parochial*, he must not only be a *Cheat*, but a *Fool*, to think he cou'd so grossly impose on the Christian World in a known Matter of Fact, in which every Man cou'd detect the Falshood of his Account.

I shall now proceed to *Cyprian's* Testimony (who is the last *Witness* produc'd by Mr. Dr — within the Compass of the Three First Centuries.)

And here I must premise, That the *Question* is not as Mr. Dr — wou'd insinuate, whether there was in *Cyprian's* Time some Distinction between the *Bishop* and his *Presbyters*; (such as is between the *Rector* of a *Parish* and his *Assistent-Curates*?) But whether *Cyprian's* Church was a *Diocess* consisting of many *Congregations* with their several *Communion-Tables*, or a *Parochial* Church consisting of one (tho' numerous) *Congregation*, with one *Altar* or *Communion-Table*? And next, how far *Cyprian* asserts his Office as *Bishop* to be distinct from that of *Presbyters*, by appropriating peculiar spiritual Powers thereto?

And as to these *Questions*, I shall freely join Issue with Mr. Dr —, and hope to give him such Evidence in reference to them, as may satisfy him that I have according to his Advice to Mr. B. — read *Cyprian* himself, and with as little Bias and Partiality as he can pretend to.

As to the former *Question*, That *Cyprian's* Church was not a *Diocesan* one made up of several *Worshipping Congregations*, with their several *Altars* or *Communion-Tables*, but one (tho' a numerous) *Congregation*, will I think fully appear from the following particulars.



1. We may justly infer this from his utter Silence concerning any such *Congregations* under his Charge (distinct from that he preach'd to himself) in all his *Epistles*, even when there was great Occasion to mention 'em if there had been any such.

'Tis hardly possible that a *Diocesan Bishop* should write so many *Letters* concerning the State of his *Diocese*, without having some Occasion to take Notice of the State of the *Parish-Churches* in it, as well as of his own *Cathedral*; And much more might this be expected in so vigilant a *Bishop* as *Cyprian* was. And yet I must profess, that after all the Search I have made, I can find no Intimation of any other *Congregation*, than One under his Care. And yet there are some Occasions in which 'tis scarce reasonable to conceive that he could have omitted the mention of such *Parish-Churches subordinate* to his *Cathedral-Church* if there had been any. I shall particularly insist on his 43d. *Epistle*, (according to Bishop *Fell's* Edition,) *Cyprian* writes that *Epistle* to his whole *Flock*, concerning the *Five Schismatical Presbyters* of *Felicissimus's* Faction. There were Eight *Presbyters* belonging to that Church of *Carthage*, Three of which, viz. *Britius*, *Rogatianus*, and *Numidicus* adher'd to the Interest of *Cyprian* their *Bishop*, then an *Exile* from 'em, the other Five made a *Separation*. Now had *Cyprian's* Church been any Thing like a modern *Diocese*, we might reasonably expect that by the Defection of these *Five Presbyters*, there would have been some *Congregations* of his *Diocese*, that would have been *vacant* and destitute of *Presbyters* to take Care of 'em. And that *Cyprian* as their *Bishop* would have lamented their destitute Condition, and been concern'd to have 'em if possible supply'd, at least by the three *Presbyters* taking their Turns among 'em, till some others could be provided. But there is not one Syllable in all that *Epistle* (or any other) to this Purpose

pose ; on the contrary, (a) He supposes these three Faithful Presbyters and the Deacons to be present with his whole Flock, and capable to corroborate every Member of it by their Exhortations, and to rule and reform the Minds of those that had fallen. He supposes these Schismatical Presbyters not to have cast themselves out of their several Congregations, but out of (b) his Church. He no where charges 'em with any Attempt to seduce their several Congregations from their Subjection to his Episcopal Authority, but only with their Endeavours (c) to arm a Part of the broken (or divided) Fraternity against the Priesthood of God, and to erect another Altar (or Communion-Table) in Opposition to his, by pretending to restore the Lapsi on more favourable Terms than the Discipline of the Church insisted on. And in the End of the Epistle (d) he proposes as the Remedy, that as soon as he shou'd be again present with 'em, he and the remaining Presbyters his Colleagues,

---

(a) Quamquam, fratres carissimi, Britius fidelissimus atque integerrimus Presbyter, item Rogatianus, & Numidicus, Presbyteri, ——— plenam vobis presentia sua diligentiam prebeant, & exhortationibus assiduis singulos corroborare, sed & lapsorum mentes consiliis salubribus regere & reformare non desinant, &c. *Cyprian. Epist. 43. pag. 227.*

(b) De Ecclesiâ sponte se pellerent. *Ibid. p. 228.*

(c) Ne parùm fuisset corripisse quorundam Confessorum mentes, & contra sacerdotium Dei portionem rupta fraternitatis amare voluisse ; nunc se ad lapsorum perniciem venenatâ suâ deceptione vertunt, ut ægros & saucios ——— a medelâ vulneris sui avocent, & intermissis precibus & orationibus, ——— ad exitiosam temeritatem mendacio captiosæ pacis invitent. *Ibid. Cathedra unâ est super Petrum fundata. Aliud Altare constitui, aut sacerdotium novum fieri præter unum altare & unum sacerdotium non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit. Ibid. pag. 229.*

(d) Persecutionis istius novissima hæc est & extrema tentatio, quæ & ipsa cito Domino protegente transibit, ut repræsentet vobis post Paschæ diem cum collegis meis, quibus presentibus secundum arbitrium quoque vestrum, & omnium nostrum commune concilium, sicut semel placuit, ea quæ agenda sunt, disponere pariter & limare poterimus. Si qui autem pœnitentiam agere & Deo satisfacere detrectans, ad Felicissimi & satellitum ejus partes concesserit, & se hæreticæ factioni conjunxerit ; sciat se postea ad Ecclesiam redire & cum Episcopis & plebe Christi communicare non posse. *Ibid. pag. 229, 230.*

would

wou'd order these Matters by common Counsel according to his Peoples Mind, and declares that none that went over to the Heretical Party and Faction of Felicissimus shou'd be re-admitted to the Communion of the Church. Let any unbiass'd Reader then judge, Whether these Five Presbyters had before their Schism any Congregations under their Care as distinct from his.

I know indeed, that Dr. Maurice pretends to draw such an Inference from some Passages in Cyprian, as if he had several Congregations to make up his Episcopal Charge. But his Arguments are so fully answer'd by Mr. Jameson in his *Cyprianus Isotimus*, that I may refer the Reader to him. I shall therefore content myself with a short Answer to 'em.

One of his Arguments is drawn from the great Sum of 781 l. 5 s. rais'd by the Church of Carthage for the Redemption of Captives, which he tells us must suppose a considerable Diocess to furnish it, especially after a terrible Persecution; but this Argument his Friend Mr. Dodwell has shewn to be of no Force. [See his *Second Letter to Mr. Baxter*, Sect. 50.] And it were easy to shew him greater Sums rais'd upon pressing Occasions by single Congregations, whose Members are generally speaking far from being rich. But Mr. Dodwell's Conceit that the Sum was 781250 l. has no other Foundation than his own Imagination. [See *Cypr. Epist.* 62. p. 275 & *Felli notam* in loc.]

Another Argument he draws from the Number of Presbyters in his Church, since when some of 'em had fallen away, There were yet so many left, That \* he advises 'em to go to the Confessors in Prison by Turns to administer

---

\* Consultite ergo & provide, ut cum temperamento hoc agi [Confessorum visitationem] tutius possit: ita ut presbyteri quoque, qui illi apud Confessores offerunt, singuli cum singulis Diaconis per vices alternent: quia & mutatio Personarum & vicissitudo convenientium miquit invidiam. *Cypr. Epist.* 5. p. 176.



the Communion to 'em, that the Changing of the Persons, and seeing new Faces daily might make 'em less envied.

*Answ.* I need not here have recourse to what *Gregory Nazianzen* tells us, concerning the Age he liv'd in, That the Number of Presbyters was sometimes greater than that of those govern'd by 'em. 'Tis evident from the whole Strain of the *Epistles* that *Cyprian* had but eight Presbyters, and this can therefore import no more than his advising those of 'em that had not fallen away to take Turns in administering the Communion to the Confessors, that a Change of Faces might render 'em less expos'd to the Notice and Envy of their Persecutors. If their Enemies were vigilant, this Advice wou'd have signified little, tho' all the Eight had been employ'd by Turns. If they were remiss, this End might be attain'd by Three taking Turns as well as by more. His next Argument is, "That when Four of his Presbyters had wrote to him about something relating to his Church, he tells his Clergy he was resolv'd from the Time he was made Bishop, to determine nothing without advising with his Clergy. *Ep.* 14. Which intimates, (saith he) That they were not of the Clergy residing at *Carthage*, because 'tis not likely that four Persons wou'd write to their Bishop without consulting their Brethren, if they liv'd together with 'em, and met at the same Altar.

*Answ.* There is no such Thing intimated, as that those four *Compresbyters* of his (as he there calls 'em) *Donatus*, *Fortuatus*, *Novatus* and *Gordius* did not reside at *Carthage*. Nor does the Reason he alledges prove any such Thing. These Four might foresee that the other four Presbyters wou'd be against what they propos'd to *Cyprian*, and they might be willing before they propos'd it to the rest to gain him over to their Mind, whose Judgment wou'd sway much both with the Presbyters and the People. But all this is so far from proving several Congregations belonging to the Episcopal Church of *Carthage*, that *Cyprian's* Words overthrow any such Inference. Since he tells these

four

four Presbyters, that from the beginning of his Episcopacy, he determin'd to do nothing by his private Opinion without their Advice and the Consent of his Flock. But how the Congregations of a Diocess shou'd meet to signify such Consent Dr. Maurice has never explain'd to us?

His last Argument is, from the Express mention of  
 " One Country-Presbyter and Deacon belonging to the  
 " Diocess of Carthage, viz, Gaius Diddensis Presbyter,  
 " who from several Passages in that Epistle, appears to  
 " to have been near the City and under its Jurisdic-  
 " tion.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. Dr. Maurice has offer'd us no Proof at all of Gaius being a Country-Presbyter, or Curate of any Village belonging to the pretended Diocess of Carthage. He may be call'd Diddensis from the Place of his Birth, not from any Countrey-Village Church he was Curate of. Besides Dr. Maurice takes it here for granted, That this Gaius communicated with the lapsed in a Place of Publick Worship, and that distinct from the Congregations he supposes in Carthage. But there is no Intimation of any such Thing in the Epistle, 'tis much more probable that this was done by him either in Time of Sickness, or in some private irregular Meeting, But that it can imply no such regular distinct Congregations belonging to Cyprian's Episcopal Church, appears from the Epistle it self. Where he saith, † That if any forward Presbyter or Deacon of our's, or any Stranger shou'd communicate with the lapsed before our Sentence, let him be suspended, and give an Account of his Rashness before us all, when God permitting we shall meet together. And then speaking of the Case of the two Subdeacons and

---

† Siquis immoderatus & præceps, sive de nostris Presbyteris, vel Diaconibus, sive de peregrinis ausus fuerit ante sententiam nostram communicare cum lapsis, a communicatione nostrâ arceatur, apud omnes nos causam dicturus temeritatis suæ, quando in unum permit- tente Deo convenerimus. *Cyp. Epist. 34. p. 217.*

the Acolyte, he saith, \* He cou'd not be alone Judge of that Affair, since many of the Clergy were absent, and what concern'd these particular Persons, was not only to be treated of and adjudg'd with his Collegues, but also with his whole People. Let the Reader then judge whether Dr. Maurice have given us any tolerable Proof of several Congregations belonging to the Episcopal Church of Carthage. To this I may add, That tho' the whole Episcopal Church of Cyprian cou'd meet together, yet in the Heat of Persecution, they might for greater Safety meet in smaller Parties. And so Cyprian himself advises 'em to do (*Ep. 5. p. 176.*) *cautè & non glomeratim nec per multitudinem simul junctam conveniendum.* But this plainly implies his whole Flock cou'd meet together.

But from this Negative, I pass

2. To a more positive Argument. Cyprian with his Collegues had in his Exile ordained Celerinus, one of the Readers of his Church, (as he had done Aurelius before) and writing to his Presbyters, Deacons, and his whole Flock, after having alledg'd the Reasons of his doing it, and largely commended the Constancy of Celerinus himself under great Sufferings; he adds, † *What was more fit than that he shou'd be set on the Pulpit, i. e. the Tribunal of the Church, that by the height of the Place he might be seen by the whole Flock, and read unto 'em the Precepts and the Gospel of the Lord, which he had so courageously and faithfully follow'd, that that Voice of his that had confess'd the Lord, might be daily heard in*

\* Cui rei non potui me solum judicem dare, cum multi adhuc de Clero absentes sint, — & hæc singulorum tractanda sit & limanda plenius ratio non tantum cum Collegis meis, sed & cum plebe ipsâ universâ. *Ibid.*

† Hunc ad nos cum tantâ Domini dignatione ventientem, — quid aliud quam super pulpitum, id est, super tribunal Ecclesiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celsitate subnixus, & plebi universâ pro honoris sui claritate conspicuus, legat præcepta & Evangelium Domini quæ fortiter ac fideliter sequitur? Vox Domini confessi in his quotidie quæ Dominus loquutus est audiatur? Viderit an sit ulterior gradus ad quem profici in Ecclesiâ possit: *Cyprian. Epist. 39. p. 224.*

reciting

reciting  
then h  
him to  
vable  
† that  
and to  
Bishop.

Had  
Charge  
mation  
to offi  
only o  
son m  
Flock?  
ders a  
the P  
whole  
That  
while  
all th  
tends  
the fa  
dream  
ing to  
univer  
dency  
of his  
than  
the I  
heard  
his E

3.  
join

† P  
conspi  
benter  
mari.



reciting what the Lord had spoken (in his Word.) And then he adds, That he had Thoughts also of advancing him to be one of the Presbyters. And the same is observable in the Ordination of Aurelius another Lector, † that he is suppos'd by Cyprian to read to the Fraternity, and to be Reader to the same Flock to whom he was Bishop.

Had there been several Congregations under Cyprian's Charge as their Bishop, How comes he to give no Intimation in which of 'em Aurelius and Celerinus were to officiate as Readers? Nay how comes he to suppose only one Pulpit for his Church, and that Celerine's Person might be seen and his Voice heard of the whole Flock? And since the Epistles concerning these Readers are directed to the Presbyters and Deacons, and to the Plebs universa, whole Flock, either Cyprian by the whole Flock means only one Part of his Flock, (viz. That which is suppos'd to meet at his own Cathedral, while there were several other Congregations besides,) or all that were under his Episcopal Charge. That he intends only one Part of his Episcopal Flock, (excluding the far greater) is what no Commentators on him ever dream'd of, and is sufficiently disprov'd from his Writing to all his Presbyters and Deacons; and the (Plebs universa) whole Flock must import all under their Presidency and Care, as well as his. If he mean the whole of his Episcopal Charge, then they cou'd be no more than a numerous Congregation, since he supposes that in the Pulpit of his Church, Celerinus might be seen and heard by the same (Plebs universa) whole Flock, to whom his Epistle is directed.

3. Cyprian's whole Church cou'd and did ordinarily join together in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

---

† Placuit ut ab officio lectionis incipiat, [ in pulpito ] a fratribus conspici, hic cum gaudio fraternitatis audiri. — Vos scio & libenter amplecti & optare tales in Ecclesia nostra quam plurimos ordinari. Cyp. Epist. 38. pag. 222.

He

He did [*Sacramenti veritatem omni fraternitate praesente celebrare*] celebrate the Sacrament in the Presence of all the Brotherhood, and supposes this to be the Practice of other Bishops as well as his. *Cypr. Epist. 63. p. 277.*

4. His whole Episcopal Church were ordinarily present in all Acts of Discipline relating to the Censure or Absolution of Offenders.

(a) He determin'd in general to do nothing by his private Opinion, without the Counsel of his Presbyters, and the Consent of his Flock.

(b) As to the Lapsi, he wou'd consider their Case in a Conference for Joint-Advice with the (neighbour-bouring) Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Confessors, and the Laity standing by.

He wou'd not be (c) Judge alone of the Case of the two Subdeacons and the Acolyte (many of the Clergy being absent and not return'd) because their Cause was to be fully treated on and consider'd, not only with his Colleagues but with his whole Flock it self.

(d) The Lapsi were to plead their Cause not only before the Clergy and the Confessors, but before the whole Flock. Nay they were to be admitted or (e) excluded

—

(a) A primordio Episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro [*nempe Presbyterorum*] & sine consensu plebis, mea privatim sententia gerere. *Cypr. Epist. 14. p. 192.*

(b) Hoc & verecundia & discipline & vici ipsi omnium nostrum convenit; ut propositi cum Clero convenientes, praesente & stantium plebe, dispo- nere omnia consilii communis religione possimus. *Epist. 19. p. 198.*

Audiant quae- so patienter consilium nostrum, expectent repressio- nem nostram, ut cum ad vos per Dei misericordiam venerimus, convocati co- episcopi plures, secundum Domini disciplinam & Confessorum praesen- tiam, [addum quaedam Editiones, & vestra quoque sententiam,] bea- torum Martyrum literas & desideria examinare possimus. *Epist. 17. p. 197. Inscríbítur Epístola, Cyprianis fratribus in plebe consistentibus.*

(c) See Cyprian's Words before pag. 158.

(d) Acturi & apud nos & apud Confessores ipsos, & apud plebem universam causam tuam. *Cypr. Epist. 16. p. 196.* So — Propositi cum Clero convenientes, praesente & stantium plebe. *Epist. 19. p. 198.*

(e) Olim secundum vestra suffragia, nunc secundum Dei iudicia, sen- tentiam conjurationis & malignitatis suae subire meruerunt. *Epist. 43. p. 229.*

according

according to the *Suffrages* of the *Brotherhood* as well as those of the *Clergy*.

The Affairs of Discipline were to be concluded (f) according to the *People's Pleasure* or *Mind*, as well as the *common Council* of the *Clergy*. They were to be (g) decided, *the People being present, and giving their Judgment*.

All these, and many more Passages of the like Import thro' *Cyprian's* Epistles, are very clear and easily accounted for, if we suppose his *Episcopal Church* to be no more than *one numerous Congregation*. But we must utterly despair of understanding 'em, if his *Episcopal Charge* consisted of *many Congregations* that cou'd no way meet together, that cou'd not be present together at such mutual Consultations, in order to their forming a Judgment concerning the Cases relating to Discipline that were to be examin'd and considered before 'em. And much less cou'd *Cyprian's Church* be like a *modern Diocess*, where the *Hundredth* or *Thousandth Part* of the Flock cou'd not be present, when such *Causes* were to be try'd and decided.

And for the Evasion that *Dr. Maurice* makes Use of to avoid the Force of such Passages as these, viz. That when all the Flock, all the Brotherhood, &c. are said to meet and be present on such Occasions, it may be understood only of *one Congregation*, (whatever is done in Publick and before a Congregation that is unlimited, being in the common way of Speaking said to be done by the whole Community,) or it may be understood of the *Bishop's Congregation*, that was more eminently call'd the Church, tho' there were other Congregations under his Charge: I cannot see how 'tis possible to reconcile it with *Cyprian's* Expressions. For when *Cyprian* writes

(f) *Secundum arbitrium vestrum, & omnium nostrum commune concilium. Ibid.*

(g) *Examinabuntur singula præsensibus & judicantibus vobis. Epist. 17. p. 197.*



to all his *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and to his *whole Flock*, it were the grossest Absurdity imaginable to suppose that he means only a *small* (perhaps a *Sixth* or *Eighth Part*) of the *Christian People* under his *Episcopal Charge*. And yet 'tis his *whole Flock* that he supposes to be present at, and concern'd in the *Judgment* to be pass'd in the Case of the *Lapsi*, and that their *Mind* was to be follow'd therein as well as the *Advice* of the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. Now had there been *Six* or *Eight Congregations* under his *Episcopal Care*, why shou'd the *Judgment* of *one* only be regarded and follow'd, and all the *rest* excluded? Where wou'd be the *Equity* of such a Proceeding, when the *other Congregations* had their *Lapsi*, as well as the *Cathedral Church*, and were equally interess'd in what shou'd be determin'd concerning their *Restoration* to the *Communion* of the *Church*? But of this more may occur under the next Head.

5. As *Cyprian* himself was chosen *Bishop* of that Church by the *Suffrages* of the *People*, so he asserts it as the general Practice of the Churches in his Time, that *all the People* over whom the *Bishop* was to preside met to choose him.

Thus in an Epistle directed to the Clergy and Flocks in *Spain* concerning *Martialis* and *Basildes*, he tells 'em, " \* That the *People* shou'd not flatter themselves as

free

---

† Nec sibi plebs blandiatur, quasi immunis esse a contagio delicti possit, cum sacerdote peccatore communicans, & ad injustum atque illicitum prepositi sui Episcopatum consensum suum commodans. — Proppter quod plebs obsequens preceptis Dominicis & Deum metuens, a peccatore preposito separare se debet; nec se ad sacrilegi sacerdotis sacrificia mittere; quando ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi. Quod & ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, ut sacerdos plebe presente, sub omnium oculis deligatur, & dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur. — Quod secundum divina magisteria observatur in Actis Apostolorum; quando de ordinando in locum Judæ Apostolo Petrus ad plebem loquitur: Surrexit, inquit, Petrus in medio discen-

tium

" fi  
" co  
" C  
" M  
" m  
" B  
" gi  
" Pe  
" w  
" fr  
" ch  
" of  
" fit  
" is  
" Ad  
" pl  
" Pl  
" of  
" ge  
" fl  
" sho

tium,  
sacerde  
animad  
vocaver  
erunt e  
totâ ge  
indigna  
& Apo  
quoque  
rité cel  
ejusdem  
plebe p  
que act  
videmu  
tatis su  
que de  
Cypri Ep

“ free from the Contagion of the Fault, when they  
 “ communicated with a sinful Priest, and gave their  
 “ Consent to the Presidency of a wicked Bishop. —  
 “ Wherefore a Flock that is obedient to God’s Com-  
 “ mands and fears him, ought to separate from a wicked  
 “ Bishop, and not join in the Sacrifices of a sacrile-  
 “ gious Priest, since the Flock or People has the chief  
 “ Power of choosing worthy Priests, and refusing un-  
 “ worthy Ones. Which we see comes down to us  
 “ from Divine Authority, That the Priest shou’d be  
 “ chosen in Presence of the Flock and in the Sight  
 “ of all, that he may be approv’d as worthy and  
 “ fit by the Judgment and Testimony of all. This  
 “ is observ’d according to Divine Authority in the  
 “ Acts of the Apostles, when *Peter* speaks to the Peo-  
 “ ple concerning the Ordination of a Bishop in the  
 “ Place of *Judas*; ’tis said, *Peter* rose up in the midst  
 “ of the Disciples, the whole Company being met to-  
 “ gether. And we may take Notice, that the Apo-  
 “ stles observ’d this not only in the Ordination of Bi-  
 “ shops and Priests, but of Deacons too; concerning

---

tium, fuit autem turba in uno. Nec hoc in Episcoporum tantum &  
 sacerdotum, sed in Diaconorum ordinationibus observasse Apostolos  
 animadvertimus, de quo & ipso in actis eorum scriptum est: Et con-  
 vocaverunt, inquit, illi duodecim totam plebem discipulorum, & dix-  
 erunt eis. Quod utique idcirco tam diligenter & caute convocata plebe  
 tota gerebatur, ne quis ad Altaris ministerium, vel ad sacerdotalem locum  
 indignus obreperet. — Propter quod diligenter de traditione divina,  
 & Apostolica observatione servandum est & tenendum quod apud nos  
 quoque, & ferè per provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes  
 ritè celebrandas, ad eam plebem, cui præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi  
 ejusdem Provinciae proximi quique conveniant, & Episcopus deligatur  
 plebe præsentè, quæ singulorum vitam plenissimè novit, & uniuscujus-  
 que actum de ejus conversatione perspexit. Quod & apud vos factum  
 videmus in Sabini collegæ nostri ordinatione, ut de universæ fraterni-  
 tatis suffragio, & de Episcoporum qui in præsentia convenerant, qui-  
 que de eo ad vos literas fecerant, judicio; Episcopatus ei deferretur.  
*Cyp. Epist. 67. pag. 288, 289.*

“ which ’tis written in the *Acts*, That the Twelve ga-  
 “ ther’d together the Multitude of the Disciples and  
 “ said to ’em, &c. Which was therefore so diligently  
 “ and carefully transacted before all the People, least  
 “ any unworthy Person shou’d by secret Arts creep in-  
 “ to the Ministry of the Altar, or the Sacerdotal  
 “ Station.

“ This therefore is to be observ’d and held, as found-  
 “ ed on Divine Tradition and Apostolical Practice.  
 “ Which is also kept up with us, and almost in all Pro-  
 “ vinces, that in Order to the right Celebration of Or-  
 “ dinations, the neighbouring Bishops of the same  
 “ Province meet with that Flock to which the Bishop  
 “ is ordain’d, and that the Bishop be chosen in  
 “ Presence of the People which knows every ones  
 “ Life, and is acquainted with their whole Conversa-  
 “ tion. Which we see was done by you in the Ordi-  
 “ nation of *Sabinus* our Colleague, that the Episcopacy  
 “ was conferr’d on him by the Suffrage of the whole  
 “ Brotherhood, and of the Bishops who were met  
 “ there, and wrote to you concerning him.”

And here again Dr. *Maurice*’s Exception will have no great Weight with unprejudic’d Persons, That because the like Expressions were us’d, concerning the *Ordinations* of the 4th, 5th and 6th Centuries at *Rome* it self, where there were *more Congregations*; they cannot import, That in these *Ordinations* in the *Third Century*, *all the Bishop’s Flock* did meet and concur in ’em. I grant indeed, that we are not oblig’d to take these Expressions in so strict a Sense, as to conclude that every *particular Member* was *present*. Some might be *absent thro’ Sickness* or *Business*, &c. but that the main Body of the People over whom the Bishop was to pre- side, met together to choose him. And when this is so fully declar’d in the above-mention’d Passage (and many other Passages of ancient Writers that might be produc’d to the same Purpose) we have no Reason to recede from their obvious Sense on the Account sug- gested by Dr. *Maurice*. Because while *Popular Elections*

still

still  
 conc  
 of th  
 gene  
 as ha  
 be f  
 nag’  
 posin  
 this  
 Cypr  
 Bisho  
 Disc  
 Wor  
 A  
 is to  
 Citie  
 by.  
 Paris  
 pels  
 of th  
 Statu  
 strou  
 sion

Se  
 real  
 by  
 whe  
 on D  
 Be  
 alled  
 of C  
 and



still continued, the same *Forms of Speech* might be us'd concerning the *People's Choice*, where yet the greatness of their Numbers, render'd 'em incapable of such a general Concurrence in the Ordination of their Bishops as had been formerly practic'd. Those *Elections* might be said to be made by *all the People*, which were manag'd by a *leading Party* among 'em, the rest not opposing their Choice, but rather acquiescing in it: But this cannot be apply'd to the *Elections* here mention'd by Cyprian, which so expressly declare the *Presence* of the *Bishops whole Flock*, both in *Elections*, and in all *Acts of Discipline*, and even in the *ordinary Parts of Publick Worship*.

And here I cannot but observe, how unreasonable it is to make the *Bishop's Churches* in a few of the greatest Cities, the Standard and Measure to judge of the rest by. 'Tis as unreasonable as to make those *overgrown Parishes* that have some Six, some Ten or Twelve *Chapels of Ease* under 'em, the Standard by which to judge of the rest: Or as if we shou'd Measure the common Stature of Men, from a few that are arriv'd to a monstrous Height and Bulk. Of which I shall have Occasion to speak more fully afterwards.

I now proceed to the

*Second Enquiry, viz.* Whether Cyprian supposes any *real Distinction of Office* between *him* and his *Presbyters*, by appropriating any spiritual Powers thereto, and whether he supposes the Difference between 'em founded on *Divine Right*?

Before I enter on this, I shall consider what Mr. Dr--- alledges from Cyprian, to countenance that *Distinction of Order*, that he supposes him to make between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*.

*Cyprian's* Words are these, “ \* Our Lord, whose Com-  
 “ mands we ought to fear and obey, instituting the  
 “ Honour of a Bishop and the Order of his Church,  
 “ speaks thus to *Peter* in the Gospel; I say unto thee,  
 “ Thou art *Peter*, and upon this Rock will I build my  
 “ Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail a-  
 “ gainst it, and I will give thee the Keys of the King-  
 “ dom of Heaven, and what thou shalt bind on Earth  
 “ shall be bound also in Heaven, &c. From whence thro’  
 “ all the Vicissitudes of Time, the Order of Bishops  
 “ and Constitution of the Church is so handed down,  
 “ that the Church is built on the Bishops, and every  
 “ Act of the Church is order’d and manag’d by them.  
 “ Seeing therefore this is founded in the Law of God,  
 “ I wonder some [of the *Lapsi*] shou’d be so rash and in-  
 “ solent as to write to me in the Name of the Church,  
 “ seeing a Church consists of a Bishop, Clergy, and of  
 “ all that stand faithful [*i.e.* in a Time of Persecution.]

Mr. Dr—— is indeed aware that I shou’d take some  
*Exceptions* against this Argument drawn from *St. Pe-*  
*ter*, and he had very good Reason to be so; for we  
 need only compare this Passage with a Parallel one of  
 the same *Author*, to overturn the Conclusion that  
 Mr. Dr—— wou’d draw from it. *Cyprian* sets himself  
 to magnify his *Parochial Episcopacy* as much as possible,  
 and speaking against such *Schismaticks* as *Novatus*, that

---

\* Dominus noster, cujus præcepta metuere & observare debemus. Episcopi honorem, & Ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in Evangelio loquitur, & dicit Petro; Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus, & super illam petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, & portæ inferorum non vincunt eam, & tibi dabo claves regni cælorum; & quæ ligaveris super terram, erunt ligata & in cælis, & quæcunque solveris super terram, erunt soluta & in cælis. Inde per temporum & successionum vires, Episcoporum ordinatio, & Ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur: & omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem Præpositos gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque divinæ lege fundatum sit, miror quosdam audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse, ut Ecclesiæ nomine literas facerent; quando Ecclesia in Episcopo & Clero, & in omnibus stantibus sit constituta. *Cyp. Ep. 32. p. 216. Vid. etiam Ep. 73. nempe, ad Jubaiantum. v. 308*

broke

broke the Unity of the Church ; “ † This (*saith he*)  
 “ therefore comes to pass (most dear Brethren) be-  
 “ cause Men return not to the Original of Truth, nor  
 “ seek the Head, nor observe the Doctrine of our hea-  
 “ venly Master. Which Things if a Man consider and  
 “ examine, there needs no long arguing about it, there  
 “ is an easy compendious Way of Truth to confirm our  
 “ Faith. Our Lord speaks to *Peter*, I say unto thee,  
 “ because thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build  
 “ my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail  
 “ against it. And I will give thee the Keys of the King-  
 “ dom of Heaven ; and what Things soever ye shall bind  
 “ on Earth shall be bound in Heaven. And again, after  
 “ his Resurrection he saith, *Feed my Sheep*. Upon One  
 “ he builds his Church : and tho’ he give an Equal  
 “ Power to all his Apostles, and say, As my Father  
 “ sent me I send you, receive the Holy Ghost, whose  
 “ Sins soever ye forgive, they are forgiven, &c. Yet

---

† Hoc ed fit, fratres dilectissimi, dum ad veritatis originem non rē-  
 ditur, nec caput queritur, nec magistri celestis doctrina servatur.  
 Quæ si quis consideret & examinet, tractatu longo atque argumento  
 opus non est. Probatio est ad fidem facilis compendio veritatis. Lo-  
 quitur Dominus ad Petrum : Ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es Petrus,  
 & super istam petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, & portæ inferorum  
 non vincent eam. Et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum ; & quæ ligave-  
 ris super terram, erunt ligata & in cœlis ; & quæcunque solveris su-  
 per terram, erunt soluta & in cœlis. Et iterum eidem post resurre-  
 ctionem suam dicit : Pasce oves meas, Super unum ædificat Ecclesiam  
 suam. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus parem potestatem tribuat & di-  
 cat ; sicut misit me Pater, & ego mitto vos, accipite Spiritum San-  
 ctum ; si cui remisceritis peccata, remittentur illi ; si cui tenueritis, te-  
 nebuntur : Tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, [unam cathedram consti-  
 tuit, & — *Ita quidam legunt, omittit Editio Felliiana*] unitatis ejusdem  
 originem ab uno incipientem suâ auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant uti-  
 que & cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi & honoris  
 & potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur ; ut Ecclesia una  
 monstretur. Cypr. *Tract. de unitate Eccles.* p. 76, --- 78. *Addunt vul-*  
*gate Editiones* — Exordium ab unitate proficiscitur. [Primatus Petri  
 datur, ut una Christi Ecclesia & Cathedra una monstretur. Et pasto-  
 res sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus  
 unanimi consensione pascatur.



“ that he might manifest Unity [he constituted one  
 “ Chair, and] by his own Authority he order’d the Be-  
 “ ginning (or Original) of that Unity, to proceed from  
 “ One Person. The rest of the Apostles were the same  
 “ that *Peter* was, being endued with the same Fellow-  
 “ ship both of Honour and Power. But the Beginning  
 “ proceeds from Unity, [There is a Primacy given  
 “ to *Peter*,] that the Church [and Chair of Christ] may  
 “ be shown to be One. [They are all indeed Pastors,  
 “ but one Flock is shown, that is to be fed by the Apo-  
 “ stles with an unanimous Consent.]

Now if we compare these two Passages together,  
 ’tis evident from ’em, That *Cyprian* gives no other *Primacy* or *Prebeminence* to his *Parochial Bishop* above his *Presbyters*, than what he ascribes to *Peter* above the rest of the *Apostles*. And since he asserts the *Equality* of all the *Apostles* in Point of *Honour* and *Power*, he only ascribes to *Peter* a *Primacy of Order*, which render’d him as it were the *Centre of Unity* to the rest of the *Apostles*. He can therefore pursuant to his Argument, ascribe no *Prebeminence* in respect of *Office* or *Power* to his *Parochial Bishop* above his *Presbyters*, but only a *Primacy of Order* for the more effectual preserving of *Unity* in particular Churches. And as such a supposed *Primacy of Peter*, made no Difference in Point of *Office* and *Power* between *him* and the rest of the *Apostles*; so neither can it constitute any such Difference of *Office*, or *Order* between his *Bishop* and *Presbyters*.

And I may add, since this Argument of *Cyprian*’s is founded on a palpable Mistake of his, as if such a *Primacy of Order* were ever given by our *Saviour* to *St. Peter*. (In which the generality of Protestant Writers, and particularly *Dr. Barrow* have shewn that he had no solid ground for his Supposition.) So his Argument for the *Divine Right* of the *Primacy*, or *Prebeminence* of a *Parochial Bishop* above his *Presbyters*, falls to the Ground with it, and the one Part of his Assertion deserves no more Credit than the other.

For the other Passages cited by Mr. Dr—— wherein *Cyprian* tells the *Deacons* who grew insolent to their *Presbyters* and their *Bishops*, that they ought to remember, that the Lord had chose Apostles, i. e. Bishops and Presidents; 'tis evident, That St. *Cyprian* by *Præpositos* there intends *Presbyters* as distinguished from *Bishops*, supposing, that the *Bishop* was in the *Confessus* of *Presbyters* what *Peter* was among the rest of the *Apostles*, and the *Presbyters* were as the *Colledge* of *Apostles*, among whom the *Bishop* had a *Primacy*. And of this Mr. *Dodwell* was so sensible, that he freely owns, that *Cyprian* made *Peter* the Type of every *Bishop*, and the rest of the *Apostles* the Type of his *Presbyters*; and therefore warmly contends for the Preheminence of St. *Peter* to support that of the *Bishop*. But we see what *Prebeminence* St. *Cyprian* intended, when he asserts all the *Apostles* to be equal in *Dignity* and *Power*, bating only this *Primacy* for *Order* and *Unity's* sake.

But in order to the fuller Resolution of this Question, I wou'd lay the following Observations from *Cyprian* before the Reader.

1. We may observe, that *Cyprian* does on all Occasions divide the Clergy into two Classes, the one including *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, the other the *Deacons*.

Thus \* he divides those to whom the Discipline of the Church is committed, into *Presidents* (including therein *Bishops* and *Presbyters*) and *Deacons*. And elsewhere speaking of the proud Deacon of whom *Rogatianus* had complain'd, he saith, "† The *Deacons* ought to remember, That the Lord hath chosen *Apostles*, i. e. *Bishops* and *Presidents* [as St. Paul calls them

\* Cum omnes omnino disciplinam tenere oporteat, multò magis Præpositos & Diaconos hoc curare fas est. *Cypr. Epist.* 4. p. 174.

† Meminisse autem Diaconi debent, quoniam Apostolos, id est Episcopos & præpositos Dominus elegit: Diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in celos Apostoli sibi constituerunt Episcopatus sui & Ecclesiæ ministros. *Epist.* 3. p. 173. — Sacerdotes & ministri, qui altari & sacrificiis deserviunt. *Epist.* 72. p. 305.

“ *οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμεῖς ἄλλοι, 1 Tim. V. 17.* ] But the Apostles after our Lord's Ascension to Heaven constituted Deacons as the Ministers or Servants of their Episcopacy, and of the Church.

2. We may observe, that in all acts of Discipline and Government, his Presbyters concurr'd with him.

Thus he tells his Presbyters \* That he earnestly desir'd to return to 'em, that they might treat of, and after due Examination determine by common Advice, what was for the common Good in Matters of Church-Government. And he † desires and enjoins 'em to supply his Place in his Absence, in doing whatever the due Administration of the Affairs of Religion requir'd. And, || As to that which our Compresbyters Donatus and Fortunatus, Novatus and Gordius wrote to me about, I cou'd write nothing back alone, because from my first Entrance on my Episcopacy, I resolv'd to do nothing by my private Judgment, without your Counsel and the Consent of my People. But when I shall thro' the Favour of God return to you, we will consider in common the Things that are done or to be done, as our mutual Respect requires.

So in Reference to the Case of the Lapsi, for whose Restoration the Confessors interceded, he saith to his Presbyters and Deacons \*\* Which Affair since it requires the

\* Ipse ad vos properare & venire debet; primò cupiditate & desiderio vestri; — tum deinde ut ea quæ circa Ecclesiæ gubernaculum utilitas communis exposcit, tractare simul & plurimorum consilio examinata limare possemus. *Epist. 14. p. 191.*

† Frerus ergo & dilectione & religione vestra, quam satis novi, his literis & hortor & mundo, ut vos — vice meâ fungamini circa gerenda ea, quæ administratio religiosa deposcit. *Ibid.*

|| Ad id quod scripserunt mihi compresbyteri nostri Donatus & Fortunatus, Novatus & Gordius, solus rescribere nihil potui; quando a primordio Episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro, & sine consensu plebis, meâ privatim sententiâ gerere; sed cum ad vos per Dei gratiam venero, tunc de iis quæ vel gesta sunt vel gerenda, sicut honor mutui poscit, in commune tractabimus. *Ibid. p. 192.*

\*\* Quæ res cum omnium nostram consilium & sententiam expectet, præjudicare ego, & solus mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo. *Epist. 26. p. 205.*

Advice

Advice  
foreba  
of the

And  
clares,  
we are

ners a  
theref  
his E  
waite  
like \*  
and O  
effect  
hasten

In  
Colleg  
Penite  
scanda  
him i  
any o  
determ

And  
riority  
his A  
Order  
Care

† In  
confule  
Sed ex  
fragia  
p. 222

\* C  
plurin  
quotid  
Fecisse  
Confe  
rarius  
jam p  
gente



Advice and Judgment of us all, I dare not judge in it beforehand, nor challenge to my self the sole Determination of that common Affair.

And in Reference to Ordinations themselves, he declares, † In all Clerical Ordinations (most dear Brethren,) we are wont to advise with you, and to ponder the Manners and Merits of every one by common Counsel; and therefore Apologizes for the Ordination of Aurelius in his Exile, because humane Testimonies were not to be waited for, where Divine Suffrages did precede. The like \* Apology he makes for his making Saturus Reader, and Optatus Subdeacon, That their Promotion had been in effect agreed on before, and was now thro' urgent Necessity hasten'd.

In short Cyprian's Presbyters were his Synthroni, his Collegues, they concurr'd with him in the Absolution of Penitents, in the Suspension and Excommunication of scandalous Members, they presid'd and judg'd with him in all Cases wherein the Laity were concern'd, or any other Affairs relating to the Congregation were determin'd.

And from hence, we may judge, whether his Superiority was any greater than that of a Parish-Rector over his Assistant-Curates, who yet are of the same Office and Order with him, tho' not equally entrusted with the Care of the Congregation. Nay, if we may judge by

† In ordinationibus Clericis, fratres Carissimi, solemus vos ante consulere, & mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare: Sed expectanda non sunt testimonia humana, cum præcedunt divina suffragia: Aurelius frater noster, a Domino jam probatus, &c. *Epist.* 38. p. 222.

\* Quoniam oportuit me per Clericos scribere; scio autem nostros plurimos absentes esse, paucos verò qui illic sunt vix ad ministerium quotidiani operis sufficere, necesse fuit novos aliquos constituere. — Fecisse me autem sciatis Lectorem Saturum, & Hypodiaconum Optatum Confessorem; quos jam pridem communi consilio Cleri proximos feceramus. — Nihil ergo a me absentibus vobis factum est, sed quod jam pridem communi consilio omnium nostrum cæperat, necessitate urgente promotum est. *Epist.* 29. p. 208.

common

common Practice, I think our *Parish-Rectors* assume a much more absolute and independent Power, in managing the Affairs relating to their *Parish-Churches*, than ever *Cyprian* did; and pay far less Respect and Deference to the Judgment of their *Curates* in such Matters, than *Cyprian* did to his *Presbyters*.

But these Things are so fully treated of by Dr. *Rule* in his *Cyprianick Bishop examin'd*, by Mr. *Lauder* in his *State of the ancient Bishop reconsider'd*, and by Mr. *Jameson* in his *Cyprianus Isotimus*, that till they are answer'd, 'tis needless to insist any longer on *Cyprian's* Testimony, which is by the Resolution of the *Questions* I have propos'd, render'd wholly unserviceable to the *Diocesan Cause*.

Having resolv'd to confine my self to Mr. Dr——'s Testimonies from the Three First Centuries, I shall at present take no further Notice of the few Scraps he has collected from *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Epiphanius*, and *Athanasius*, than to suggest the following particulars.

For *Gregory Nazianzen*, if ever he thought the Office of a *Bishop* above *Presbyters* to be of *Divine Right*, I know not how to reconcile it with his passionate Wish.  
 “ † Wou'd to God, there were no Prelacy, no Prerogative of Place, no tyrannical Priviledges, that we  
 “ might be distinguish'd by Vertue alone. Now this  
 “ right and left Hand, and middle Rank, these higher  
 “ and lower Dignities, and this State-like Precedency  
 “ have caus'd many fruitless Conflicts and Bruises, have  
 “ cast many into the Pit, and carried away Multitudes to the Place of the Goats.” But the Truth is,

---

† Ὡς ὄφελόν γε μὴδὲ λῶ' ἀρετῆς, μὴδὲ πρὸς τύπῃ ἀρετῆς καὶ πρὸς ἀντικεινῇ ἀρετῇ, ἢ ἀρετῆς μόνῃς ἐκινῶμεθα. νῦν δὲ τὸ δεξιὸν τὸ καὶ τὸ ἀριστερὸν, καὶ τὸ μέσον, καὶ τὸ ὑψηλότερον καὶ τὸ χαθ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὸ ἀντικεινῇ συμβαδίζον, πολλὰ τεποίηκε τὰ συνέλημματα ἡμῶν διακινῆς, καὶ πολλὰς εἰς ὁδὸν ὥστε, καὶ εἰς τὴν πᾶν ἐρίων χώραν ἀπήγαγεν. *Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. 28.*  
 Op. Vol. I. p. 484.

the Passages cited by Mr. Dr—— speak nothing to the Point in question.

The same may be said concerning the Passage he cites from *Athanasius*, we will freely grant him; *That whoever despises the Office of a Bishop despiseth Christ who ordain'd it*; but what signifies this to prove the Office of a *Presbyter*, to be a distinct Office from that of a *Bishop*?

As to *Epiphanius*, I wou'd not have Mr. Dr—— lay any great Stress upon his Testimony; for he has prov'd the Superiority of *Bishops* above *Presbyters*, by Arguments much of the like Weight and Force, as he has prov'd the expediency of *praying for the Dead*. Besides his *Bishops* were generally *Parochial* ones, as I shall have Occasion to observe afterwards.

And for his Decree of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which he calls an *Act of the Church*, that determines it to be *Sacrilege to depress a Bishop down to the Degree of a Presbyter*, as it speaks nothing of the Point of *Divine Right*, so it may deserve the Consideration of those *Diocesan Bishops*, that have depress'd so many *Parish-Rectors* (the true *Primitive Bishops*) down to the Degree of *Presbyters*, nay far below that of the *ancient Presbyters* (after the Distinction between *them* and *Bishops* begun.) And if Mr. Dr—— wou'd have this pass for *Sacrilege*, he sees where the Guilt of it is most applicable.

For the *Testimonies* he boasts of from *St. Austin* and *St. Ambrose*, we shall consider 'em when he is pleas'd to produce 'em; but I would advise him to prove either of 'em to be properly *Diocesan Bishops* before he makes Use of their Testimony.

But I cannot dismiss this Head of *Antiquity*, without taking some Notice of the Passage wherewith Mr. Dr—— concludes it, wherein he pretends, "That *St. Jerome* himself is of his Opinion concerning the Three Orders of the Clergy as of *Divine Right*, and only pleads for the Name of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, being promiscuously us'd in Scripture, but supposes



“ poses the supream Ecclesiastical Power lodg’d in the  
 “ Bishops as the Successors of the Apostles, which the  
 “ Presbyters were never vested in.

Mr. Dr—— must have a mean Opinion of his Reader’s Understanding, or expect that he shou’d resign up his Judgment by an implicate Faith to his *ipse dixit*, or else he wou’d never assert so strange a *Paradox* as this, with such an Air of Assurance, when he knows how great a Stress all the Divines of the Reformed Churches lay on *Jerome’s* Testimony, (as to the Judgment of *Antiquity* in this Matter) and how entirely they have baffled all the Sophistry wherewith such learned *Jesuits*, as *Petavius*, *Bellarmino*, *Bailly*, and others, have endeavour’d to elude *Jerome’s* Testimony, how fully some of the *Learned Divines* of the *Establish’d Church* have joined with ’em herein, in Opposition to the *Popish Writers*; nay, how ingenuously and fairly some of the more candid *Romanists* have given up the Cause by owning, That *Jerome’s* Sentiments were the same with those of *Aerius*, as to the Scriptural *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, being the same not only in Name but in Office. After all this, for Mr. Dr—— to perswade us, That he was of a quite different Opinion, without offering one Syllable for the Proof of it, looks as if he had a Mind to impose on our easy Credulity.

I shall therefore lay before the Reader *Jerome’s* Sentiments in this Point, not from occasional Passages, but from such wherein he most expressly declares his Judgment concerning it: I shall take some Notice of the Artifices us’d by the *Popish Writers* in their Defence of the Divine Right of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, either to evade his Testimony, or to affix a quite contrary Sense to his Expressions, and shall endeavour to shew what Violence they are oblig’d to offer to his plain Words; and on what frivolous Grounds they go in perverting the obvious Sense of ’em. And I choose to do this the rather, because none of the ancient Writers have more accurately observ’d the first rise of *Parochial Episcopacy*, and the Occasion of it, and the Deviation

made

made therein from the *Apostolical Parity*, and have more evidently ascrib'd this not to any *Divine Institution*, but only to *Ecclesiastical Custom*. So that his Sentiments will greatly illustrate and confirm the *Testimonies* already produc'd from the most celebrated Writers of the Three First Ages, and a few *Observations* thereon shall conclude this Chapter concerning the *Testimony* of the ancient *Fathers* in this *Controversy*.

I shall first cite the Passages wherein *Jerome* most clearly delivers his Judgment in this Matter.

\* "Let us diligently attend the Words of the *Apostle* saying, *that thou mayst ordain Elders in every City*

\* *Diligenter Apostoli verba attendamus dicentis, Ut constituas per civitates presbyteros, sicut ego tibi disposui. Qui qualis presbyter debeat ordinari, in consequentibus differens, hoc ait: Siquis est sine crimine, unius uxoris vir; & cetera: postea intulit, oportet enim Episcopum sine crimine esse, tanquam Dei dispensatorem. Idem est ergo Presbyter qui Episcopus: & antequam Diaboli instinctu, audia in religione fierent: & diceretur in populis, ego sum Pauli, ego Apollonis, ego autem Cepha: communi presbyterorum consilio, ecclesiae gubernantur. Postquam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos putabat esse, non Christi: in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris: ad quem omnis ecclesiae cura pertineret: & schismatum semina tollerentur. Putat aliquis non scripturatum, sed nostram esse sententiam, episcopum & presbyterum unum esse; & aliud aetatis, aliud esse nomen officii: relegat Apostoli ad Philippenses verba dicentis: Paulus & Timotheus servi Jesu Christi, omnibus sanctis in Christo Jesu, qui sunt Philippis, cura episcopis & diaconis, gratia vobis & pax, & reliqua. Philippis una est urbs Macedonia: & certe in una civitate plures, ut nuncupantur, episcopi esse non poterant. Sed quia eosdem Episcopos illo tempore quos & Presbyteros appellabant: propterea indifferenter de Episcopis quasi de presbyteris est locutus. Adhuc hoc alicui videatur ambiguum, nisi altero testimonio comprobetur. In Actibus Apostolorum scriptum est, quod cum venisset Apostolus Miletum, emisit Ephefum; & vocaverit presbyteros ecclesiae ejusdem, quibus postea inter cetera sit locutus: Attendite vobis & omni gregi, in quo vos Spiritus sanctus posuit episcopos, pascere ecclesiam Domini, quam acquisivit per sanguinem suum. Et hic diligentiùs observate, quomodo unus civitatis Ephefi presbyteros vocans postea eosdem episcopos dixerit. Si quis vult recipere eam Epistolam, quae sub nomine Pauli ad Hebraeos scripta est: & ibi aequaliter inter plures ecclesiae cura dividitur. Siquidem ad plebem scribit, Parete principibus*

" as I have appointed thee. Who discoursing in what  
 " follows, what Sort of *Presbyter* is to be ordain'd, saith,  
 " If any one be blameless, the Husband of one Wife, &c.  
 " afterwards adds, For a Bishop must be blameless as the  
 " Steward of God, &c. The *Presbyter* is therefore the  
 " same with the Bishop. And before, by the Devil's  
 " Instinct there were Parties in Religion, and it was  
 " said among the People, I am of Paul, I am of Apollos,  
 " I of Cephas, the Churches were govern'd by the com-  
 " mon Counsel of *Presbyters*. But after every one  
 " thought those that he baptiz'd to be rather his than  
 " Christ's, it was determin'd (or agreed) in the whole  
 " World, that one of the *Presbyters* shou'd be set a-  
 " bove the rest, to whom all Care of the Church shou'd  
 " belong, and the Seeds of Division taken away. If  
 " any one shou'd think it our Opinion and not that of  
 " the Scriptures, that Bishop and *Presbyter* are the same;  
 " and that one is the Name of Age, the other of Office.  
 " Let him read again the Words of the Apostle to the  
 " *Philippians*, saying, Paul and Timothy the Servants of  
 " Jesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Jesus, that are  
 " at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons, Grace be to  
 " you, &c. *Philippi* is a City of Macedonia; and cer-

principibus vestris, & subjecti estote: ipsi enim sunt qui vigilant pro  
 animabus vestris, quasi rationem reddentes, ne suspirantes hoc faciant.  
 Siquidem hoc utile [leg. inutile] vobis est. Et Petrus, qui ex fidei fir-  
 mitate nomen accepit, in epistola sua loquitur dicens, Presbyteros erga  
 in vobis obsecro compresbyter, & testis Christi passionum, qui & ejus  
 gloriæ quæ in futuro revelanda est, socius sum, pascite eum qui in vo-  
 bis est gregem Domini, non quasi cum necessitate, sed voluntarie. Hac  
 propterea, ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse presbyteros  
 quos & episcopos: paulatim vero ut dissensionum plantaria evellerentur,  
 ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt  
 se ex ecclesiæ consuetudine ei qui sibi prepositus fuerit esse subjectos:  
 ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Domi-  
 nice veritate, Presbyteris esse majores: & in commune debere eccle-  
 siam regere, imitantes Moysen: qui cum haberet in potestate solus præ-  
 esse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit cum quibus populum judicaret.  
 Videamus igitur qualis Presbyter sive episcopus ordinandus sit. Hier-

ron. Comment. in Titum, Op. tom. 9. p. 103.

tainly



tainly in one City there cou'd not be more *Bishops*  
 (as they are stil'd.) But because at that Time they  
 call'd the same Persons *Bishops* that they call'd *Pres-*  
*byters*, therefore he speak indifferently of *Bishops* as  
 of *Presbyters*. This may seem farther doubtful to  
 some till it be prov'd by another Testimony. 'Tis  
 written in the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, that when the  
*Apostle* came to *Miletus* he sent to *Ephesus*, and  
 call'd the *Presbyters* of that Church; to whom among  
 other Things he said *Take heed to your selves, and to*  
*all the Flock over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you*  
*Bishops, to feed the Church of God, which he has pur-*  
*chased with his own Blood.* And observe this dili-  
 gently, how calling together the *Presbyters* of the  
 one City of *Ephesus*, he afterwards calls the same  
 (*Presbyters*) *Bishops*. If any will receive that *Epistle*  
 which is wrote in the Name of *Paul* to the *Hebrews*,  
 there also the Care of the Church is equally divided  
 among many, since he writes to the People, Obey  
 them that have the Rule over you, and submit your  
 selves, for they watch for your Souls as those that must  
 give an Account, that they may not do it with Grief,  
 for this is unprofitable for you. And *Peter* who receiv'd  
 his Name from the Strength of his Faith, in his  
*Epistle* saith, The *Presbyters* among you I intreat,  
 who am also a *Presbyter*, and a Witness of the *Suf-*  
*ferings* of *Christ*, and a Partaker of the Glory that  
 is to be reveal'd, feed the Flock of God that is  
 among you, not of constraint, but willingly, [1 Pet. V.  
 1. &c.] These Things are alledg'd, that we might  
 shew that among the Ancients, the *Presbyters* were  
 the same with the *Bishops*; but by little and little,  
 the whole Care was devolv'd on one, (that the Seeds  
 of Dissention might be pluck'd up.) As therefore  
 the *Presbyters* know, that by the Custom of the Church  
 they are subject to him, who is their President (*Præpo-*  
*situs*; ) so let *Bishops* know that they are above *Pres-*  
*byters* more by the Custom of the Church, than the  
 real Appointment of the Lord, and that they ought to

“ rule the Church in common, imitating *Moses*, who  
 “ when he might alone rule the People of *Israel*, chose  
 “ *Seventy* with whom he might judge the People. Let  
 “ us then see, what Sort of *Presbyter* or *Bishop* is to be  
 “ ordain’d.

Again, “ \* In both *Epistles* ( 1 *Tim.* III. and *Tit.* I.)  
 “ both *Bishops* and *Presbyters* ( tho’ among the *Ancients*  
 “ the *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were the *same*, for the one  
 “ is a *Name* of *Dignity*, the other of *Age* ) are to be  
 “ chosen, only *Husbands* of one *Wife*.

In another *Epistle*, † “ We read in *Esay*, *That the*  
 “ foolish

\* In utraq[ue] Epistolâ, sive episcopi, sive Presbyteri (quanquam apud  
 veteres iidem episcopi & presbyteri tuerint; quia illud nomen dignita-  
 tis est, hoc ætatis) jubentur monogami in clerum eligi. Hieron. Ep. ad  
 Oceanum. Op. Tom. 2. p. 106.

† Legimus in *Esaia*: Fatuus fatua loquetur. Audio quendam in  
 tantam erupisse vecordiam: ut diaconos Presbyteris, id est, episcopis  
 anteferreret. Nam cum Apostolus perspicue doceat eosdem esse presby-  
 teros quos Episcopos: quid patitur mensarum & viduarum minister,  
 ut supra eos se tumidus efferrat ad quorum preces Christi Corpus san-  
 guisque conficitur? Queris auctoritatem? Audi Testimonium. Paulus  
 & Timotheus servi Christi Jesu, omnibus sanctis in Christo Jesu, qui  
 sunt Philippis, cum Episcopis & Diaconis. Vis & aliud exemplum?  
 In Actibus Apostolorum ad unius Ecclesiæ Sacerdotes ita Paulus loquitur:  
 Attendite vobis & cuncto gregi, in quo vos Spiritus sanctus po-  
 suit episcopos, ut regeretis ecclesiam Domini, quam acquisivit sanguine  
 suo. Ac ne quis contentiose in unâ Ecclesia plures episcopos fuisse con-  
 tendit, audi & aliud testimonium, in quo manifestissime comprobatur  
 eundem esse episcopum atque presbyterum. Propter hoc reliqui te in  
 Cretâ, ut quæ deerant corrigeres, & constitueres presbyteros per civi-  
 tates, sicut & ego tibi mandavi. Si quis est sine crimine, unus uxoris  
 vir, filios habens fideles, non in accusatione luxuriæ, aut non subditos.  
 Oporteret enim Episcopum sine Crimine esse, quasi Dei dispensatorem.  
 Et ad Timotheum: Noli negligere gratiam quæ in te est, quæ tibi da-  
 ta est prophetiæ, per impositionem manuum presbyterii. Sed & Pe-  
 trus in primâ Epistolâ: Presbyteros, inquit, in vobis precor compres-  
 byter, & testis passionum Christi, & futura gloriæ quæ revelanda est  
 particeps, regere gregem Christi, & inspicere non ex necessitate, sed  
 voluntariè juxta Deum. Quod quidem Græcè significantius dicitur,  
 ἑμεκονόντες id est, superintendentes, unde & nomen Episcopi tractum  
 est. Parvâ tibi videntur tantorum virorum testimonia? Clangat tuba  
 Evangelica, filius tonitru, quem Jesus amavit plurimum, qui de pec-  
 tore salvatoris doctrinarum fluentia potavit: Presbyter, electæ Domina

*foolish Man will speak foolish Things; I hear that a certain Person is broke out into such Folly, that he prefers Deacons before Presbyters, that is, before Bishops. For when the Apostle clearly teaches, that Presbyters and Bishops were the same, who can endure it, that a Minister of Tables and of Widows shou'd proudly exalt himself above those, at whose Prayers the Body and Blood of Christ is made? Do you seek for Authority? Hear that Testimony, Paul and Timothy Servants of Jesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Jesus, that are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons. Would you have another Example? In the Acts of the Apostles Paul speaks thus to the Priests of one Church, Take heed to your selves, and to all the Flock over whom the Holy Ghost has made you Bishops, that you govern the Church which he has purchas'd with his own Blood. And lest any one shou'd wrangle about more Bishops being in one Church; hear also another Testimony by which it may most manifestly be prov'd, That the Bishop and Presbyter is the same. For this Cause left I thee in Crete, that*

& filiis ejus, quos ego diligo in veritate. Et in alia Epistolâ: Presbyter, Caio charissimo, quem ego diligo in veritate. Quod autem potest unus electus est, qui ceteris preponeretur, in schismatis remedium actum est: ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi Ecclesiam rumperet. Nam & Alexandria a Marco Evangelistâ usque ad Heraclam & Dionysium episcopos, presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant: quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat: aut diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, & archidiaconum vocent. Quid enim facit exceptâ ordinatione episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat? Nec altera Romanæ urbis Ecclesia, altera totius orbis æstimanda est. Et Galliæ, & Britanniæ, & Africa, & Persis, & Oriens, & India, & omnes barbaræ nationes, unum Christum adorant: unam observant regulam veritatis. Si Autoritas quaeratur, orbis major est urbe. Ubique fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii; sive Alexandria, sive Canis; ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, & paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt. Hieron. Ep. Exagr. Op. Tom. 2. p. 109.



" thou should'st set in Order the Things that are wanting  
 " and ordain Presbyters in every City as I have appointed  
 " thee; if any be blameless, the Husband of one Wife, &c.  
 " For a Bishop must be blameless, as the Steward of God.  
 " And to Timothy, Neglect not the Gift that is in thee,  
 " which was given thee by Prophecy, by the laying on of  
 " the Hands of the Presbytery. And Peter also in his  
 " First Epistle, saith, The Presbyters among you I intreat,  
 " who are also a Presbyter, and a Witness of the Sufferings  
 " of Christ, and a Partaker of the Glory that is to be  
 " reveal'd, to rule the Flock of Christ, and to inspect it,  
 " not of Constraint, but willingly according to God,  
 " which is more significantly express'd in the Greek  
 " ἑποπτεύεις, i. e. superintending it, whence the Name  
 " of Bishop is drawn. Do the Testimonies of such Men  
 " seem finall to thee? Let the Evangelical Trumpet  
 " sound, the Son of Thunder, whom Jesus lov'd much,  
 " who drunk the Streams of Doctrine from our Sa-  
 " viour's Breast, the Presbyter to the Elect Lady and her  
 " Children, whom I love in the Truth: And in another  
 " Epistle, The Presbyter to the beloved Gaius whom I  
 " love in the Truth. But that One was afterwards cho-  
 " sen who thou'd be set above the rest, was done as a  
 " Remedy against Schism, lest every one drawing the  
 " Church of Christ to himself, shou'd divide (or break)  
 " it. For at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist  
 " to Heraclas and Dionysius the Bishops thereof, the  
 " Presbyters always nam'd one chosen out of them, and  
 " plac'd in an higher Degree, Bishop. As if an Army shou'd  
 " make an Emperor, or the Deacons shou'd choose one  
 " of themselves whom they knew to be most diligent  
 " and call him Archdeacon. For what does a Bishop  
 " except Ordination, that a Presbyter may not do  
 " Nor is the Church of the City of Rome, different  
 " from other Churches in the World. Both Gaul and  
 " Britain, and Africk and Persia, and the East and India  
 " and all barbarous Nations adore one Christ, and ob-  
 " serve one Rule of Truth. If Authority be requir'd  
 " the World is greater than the City. Wherever a Bishop

" shop  
 " Conf  
 " he is  
 " Pow  
 " not  
 " fors  
 " And  
 " and  
 " Dign  
 " there  
 " Deac  
 " ter i  
 " is ad  
 " Pres  
 " be p  
 " mad  
 " be c  
 " be t  
 " rior  
 " know  
 " of t  
 " and  
 " Pres  
 " the  
 " The  
 " fully d  
 " dent fi  
 " but Of

\* Pre  
 Unde &  
 conidici  
 byter co  
 Aut igit  
 no comp  
 presbyte  
 sciamus  
 Aaron &  
 presbyte

shop shall be, whether at *Rome*, or *Eugubium*, or  
*Constantinople*, or *Regium*, or *Alexandria*, or *Tanis*,  
 he is of the *same Merit*, of the *same Priesthood*. The  
 Power of Riches or the Meanness of Poverty, makes  
 not a *Bishop* higher or lower, but all are the Succes-  
 sors of the Apostles, &c.

And a little after in the same Epistle, \* "*Presbyter*  
 and *Bishop*, the one is the Name of Age, the other of  
 Dignity; whence in the Epistle to *Timothy* and *Titus*,  
 there is mention of the Ordination of *Bishop* and  
*Deacon*, but not of *Presbyters*, because the *Presby-*  
*ter* is included in the *Bishop*. He that is advanc'd,  
 is advanc'd from less to greater, either then let a  
*Presbyter* be ordain'd a *Deacon*, that the *Presbyter* may  
 be prov'd inferior to a *Deacon*, reckoning his being  
 made a *Deacon* an Advancement; or if the *Deacon*  
 be ordain'd a *Presbyter*, let him know that tho' he  
 be thereby inferior in Point of Gain, he is supe-  
 rior in respect of *Priesthood*. And that we may  
 know that the Apostolical Traditions are taken out  
 of the Old Testament, what *Aaron* and his *Sons*,  
 and the *Levites* were in the Temple, let *Bishops* and  
*Presbyters* and *Deacons* challenge to themselves in  
 the Church.

These being the *Passages* wherein *St. Jerome* has most  
 fully declar'd his Sentiments in this Matter, 'Tis evi-  
 dent from 'em, that 'tis not a bare *Community* of Names  
 but *Office*, that he asserts between *Presbyters* and *Bishops*

---

\* *Presbyter & Episcopus, aliud ætatis, aliud dignitatis est nomen.*  
*Unde & ad Titum & ad Timotheum de ordinatione Episcopi & Dia-*  
*conidicitur: de presbyteris omninò reticetur: quia in Episcopo & Pres-*  
*byter continetur. Qui provehitur, a minori ad majus provehitur.*  
*Aut igitur ex presbytero ordinatur diaconus, ut presbyter minor dia-*  
*cono comprobetur, in quem crescit ex parvo: aut si ex diacono ordinatur*  
*presbyter, noverit se lucris minorem, sacerdotio esse majorem. Et ut*  
*sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri testamento, quod*  
*Aaron & filii ejus atque levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi episcopi &*  
*presbyteri & diaconi vendicent in ecclesiâ. Ibid.*

in the *Apostle's* Time. He asserts, That the Churches in the *Apostolical* Age were govern'd by the common Council of Presbyters, who were then the same with Bishops. That the Church in the one City of Ephesus was govern'd by *Presbyter-Bishops*. That the Care of the Church was then equally divided among many. That the devolving the chief Care of the Church on one was introduc'd afterwards, and that (*paulatim*) gradually, by little and little. And therefore, tho' the Presbyters were by the Custom or Use of the Church, now in some Subjection to Bishops; yet the Bishops ought to know and consider, that this Superiority of theirs was only founded on Ecclesiastical Custom not on Divine Appointment, and therefore ought to rule the Church in common with the Presbyters. That Timothy was ordain'd by the laying on of the Hands of the Presbyters. That it belong'd to Presbyters, *Emendare*, to act the Part of Bishops in superintending the Flock committed to 'em. That the choosing one to set above the rest was done afterward, as a Remedy against Schism. And yet that even in his Age and Time, the Presbyters actually exercis'd all the same Spiritual Powers that Bishops did, except that of Ordination.

This being the obvious Sense of St. *Jerome's* Expressions, without any Manner of Force offer'd to 'em, I shall take some Notice of the various Artifices which the *Popish Writers*, especially the *Jesuites* make Use of to elude this clear Testimony of his, and to ascribe to *Jerome* the quite opposite Sentiments.

Thus *Bellarmino* pretends, [*De Clericis*, Lib.I. cap.15.] " That St. *Jerome* supposes the superior Office of a Bishop instituted by the Apostles themselves, on the Occasion of the Schism in the Church of Corinth, because speaking of the Parties in Religion, he uses these Words of the *Apostle Paul*, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, &c.

But this Objection is so fully answer'd by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, that I shall present the Reader with it in his own Words. *Iren.* p. 279, &c.



First, " That it is impossible *Jerome's* Meaning  
 " shou'd be restrain'd to that individual Time, because  
 " the Arguments which *Jerome* brings, that the Name  
 " and Office of Bishops and Presbyters were the same,  
 " were from Things done after this time. *Paul's* first  
 " Epistle to the *Corinthians*, wherein he reproves their  
 " Schisms, was written according to *Ludovicus Capellus*  
 " in the 12th Year of *Claudius*, of *Christ* 51. after  
 " which *Paul* wrote his Epistle to *Titus*, from whose  
 " Words *Jerome* grounds his Discourse; but most cer-  
 " tainly *Paul's* Epistle to the *Philippians* was not writ-  
 " ten till *Paul* was Prisoner at *Rome*. The Time of  
 " the writing of it is plac'd by *Capellus* in the 3d of  
 " *Nero*, of *Christ* 56, by *Blondell* 57, by our *Ligh-*  
 " *foot* 59, by all long after the former to the *Corin-*  
 " *thians*; yet from the first Verse of this Epistle *Je-*  
 " *rome* fetcheth one of his Arguments. So *Paul's* Charge  
 " to the Elders at *Miletus*, *Peter's* Epistle to the dis-  
 " persed *Jews*, were after that Time too, yet from  
 " these are fetch'd two more of *Jerome's* Arguments.  
 " Had he then so little common Sense, as to say that  
 " Episcopacy was instituted upon the Schism at *Corinth*,  
 " and yet bring his Arguments for Parity after the Time,  
 " that he sets for the Institution of Episcopacy. But  
 " Secondly, *Jerome* doth not say, *cum diceretur apud*  
 " *Corinthios, ego sum Pauli, &c.* but *cum diceretur in*  
 " *populis, ego sum Pauli, &c.* so that he speaks not of  
 " that particular Schism, but of a general and univer-  
 " sal Schism abroad among most People, which was  
 " the Occasion of appointing Bishops; and so speaks  
 " of others imitating the Schism and Language of the  
 " *Corinthians*. Thirdly, Had Episcopacy been insti-  
 " tuted on the Occasion of the Schism at *Corinth*, cer-  
 " tainly of all Places we shou'd the soonest have heard  
 " of a Bishop at *Corinth* for the remedying of it; and  
 " yet almost of all Places, those Heralds that derive  
 " the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles Times,  
 " are the most plunged whom to fix on at *Corinth*.  
 " And they that can find any one single Bishop at *Co-*

“ *rimb*, at the Time that *Clemens* writ his Epistle to  
 “ them, (about another Schism as great as the former,  
 “ which certainly had not been according to their Opi-  
 “ nion, if the Bishop had been there before,) must  
 “ have better Eyes and Judgment than the deservedly  
 “ admir’d *Grotius*, who brings this in his Epistle to  
 “ *Bignonius*, as one Argument of the undoubted An-  
 “ tiquity of that Epistle: *Quod nusquam meminit ex-*  
 “ *sortis illius Episcoporum auctoritatis, qua Ecclesia con-*  
 “ *suetudine, post Marci obitum Alexandria, atque eo*  
 “ *exemplo alibi introduci capit; sed planè ut Paulus A-*  
 “ *postolus ostendit Ecclesias communi Presbyterorum qui*  
 “ *iidem omnes & Episcopi ipsi Pauloque dicuntur, consi-*  
 “ *lio fuisse gubernatas.* What cou’d be said with greater  
 “ Freedom, that there was no such Episcopacy then  
 “ at *Corinth*? Fourthly, They who use this Argu-  
 “ ment are greater Strangers to *Jerome*’s Language than  
 “ they wou’d seem to be: Whose Custom it is upon  
 “ incidental Occasions to accommodate the Phrase and  
 “ Language of Scripture to them; As when he speaks  
 “ of *Chrysostome*’s Fall, *cecidit Babylon, cecidit*; of the  
 “ Bishops of *Palestine*, *multi utroque claudicant pede*;  
 “ of the *Roman* Clergy, *Phariseorum conclamavit Sena-*  
 “ *tus*; but which is most clear to our Purpose, he applies  
 “ this very Speech to the Men of his own Time; *Quando*  
 “ *non id ipsum omnes loquimur, & alius dicit ego sum Pauli,*  
 “ *ego Apollo, ego Cepha, dividimus spiritus unitatem, &*  
 “ *eam in partes & membra discerpimus.* All which  
 “ Instances are produc’d by *Blondell*, but have the  
 “ good Fortune to be pass’d over without being taken  
 “ Notice of.

And to these solid Reasons allerdg’d by that learned  
 Person, I may add, That *Jerome* speaks of those Schisms  
 that were occasion’d by the People’s Differences about  
 those Presbyters, whom he supposes to have govern’d ’em  
 before by common Consent; he supposes those Presby-  
 ters themselves to be instrumental in promoting those  
 Schisms, and that the giving one of the Presbyters them-  
 selves a Presidency above the rest, was the Remedy

found

found out and us'd to prevent 'em; but this can no way agree to the *Schism* at *Corinth* mention'd by the *Apostle*. For the *Schism* at *Corinth* was occasion'd by some of 'em preferring one *Apostle* before another, as the *Head* of their *Party*; whereas the *Apostles* themselves had no Hand at all in these *factious* *Sidings*. Nor was the Preference of any one *Apostle* above the rest, ever then thought or propos'd as a *Remedy* against such *Divisions*.

Others argue from those Words of *Jerome*, " It was agreed or decreed in the whole World, that one shou'd be set above the rest, to whom all the Care of the Church shou'd belong, &c. That since there was no general Council that met to make any such Decree, his Words must imply that it was a Constitution of the *Apostles* themselves.

To this I answer,

1. This Exposition of *Jerome's* Words supposes him to contradict himself.

For he had told us just before, *That the Churches were at first govern'd by the common Council of their Presbyters*, he afterwards produces as a Proof of it, *That the Church of Philippi and Ephesus was so govern'd in the Apostle's Time. And that the Care of those Churches was there equally divided among many, to whom St. Paul directs his Epistle to the Hebrews; and so were those to whom St. Peter writes, and he cites St. John himself as herein concurring with 'em.* How come the *Apostles* then first to establish one Form of Government, and then of a sudden overturn it, and set up another? And how comes *St. Jerome* to suppose this Alteration to be brought in gradually, and that upon the Inconveniences he supposes to be found by Experience in that *Parity*, from the *Contest* and *Sidings* of the *Presbyters*, if on the contrary it was by a general Agreement and Appointment of the *Apostles* themselves? And *Dr. Stillingfleet* has here well observ'd, that the Words themselves will not admit of this Sense. *Irenic.* p. 282. " The Matter of the Decree being, *ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæ-*  
" *teris*



“ *veris*. One chosen not only out of, but by the Pres-  
 “ byters, shou’d be set above the rest; for so *Jerome* must  
 “ be understood. For the Apostles cou’d not them-  
 “ selves choose out of all Presbyteries one Person to  
 “ be set above the rest. And withal, the Instance  
 “ brought of the Church of *Alexandria*, makes it evi-  
 “ dent to be meant of the choosing by the Presbyters,  
 “ and not by the Apostles: Besides, did *Jerome* mean  
 “ choosing by the Apostles, he wou’d have given some  
 “ Intimation of the Hand the Apostles had in it, which  
 “ we see not in him the least Ground for.

2. The same learned Divine gives us the true Ac-  
 count of *Jerome’s* Meaning, *Irenic*. p. 280. viz. “ That  
 “ his *toto orbe decretum est*, relates not to an antecedent  
 “ Order which was the Ground of the Institution of E-  
 “ piscopacy, but to the universal Establishment of that  
 “ Order, which came up on the Occasion of so ma-  
 “ ny Schisms. It is therefore something consequent  
 “ to the first setting up of Episcopacy, which is the  
 “ general obtaining of it in the Churches of Christ,  
 “ when they saw its Usefulness in order to the Churches  
 “ Peace; therefore the Emphasis lies not in *decretum*  
 “ *est*, but in *toto orbe*, noting how suddenly this Or-  
 “ der met with universal Acceptance when it first was  
 “ brought up in the Church after the Apostles Death.  
 “ Which that it was *Jerome’s* Meaning, appears by  
 “ what he saith after, *paulatim verò, (ut dissensionum*  
 “ *plantaria evellerentur) ad unum omnem sollicitudinem*  
 “ *esse delatam*. Where he Notes the gradual obtaining  
 “ of it, which I suppose was thus according to his  
 “ Opinion; First, in the Colledge of Presbyters ap-  
 “ pointed by the Apostles, there being a Necessity of  
 “ Order, there was a President among them, who had  
 “ *Ἀνδριστὴν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, as the President of the Se-  
 “ nate, i. e. did moderate the Affairs of the Assembly  
 “ by proposing Matters to it, gathering Voices, being  
 “ the first in all Matters of Concernment, but he had  
 “ not *Ἀνδριστὴν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, as *Casaubon* well distin-  
 “ guisheth them, i. e. had no Power over his Fellow-  
 “ Pres-

" Presbyters, but that still resided in the Colledge  
 " or Body of them. After this when the Apostles  
 " were taken out of the Way, who kept the main  
 " Power in their own Hands of ruling the several Pres-  
 " byteries, or delegated some to do it (who had a main  
 " Hand in the planting Churches with the Apostles,  
 " and thence are call'd in Scripture sometimes Fellow-  
 " Labourers in the Lord, and sometimes Evangelists,  
 " and by *Theodoret*, Apostles, but of a second Order)  
 " after I say, these were deceas'd, and the main Power  
 " left in the Presbyteries, the several Presbyters en-  
 " joying an equal Power among themselves, especially  
 " being many in one City, thereby great Occasion was  
 " given to many Schisms, partly by the bandying of Pres-  
 " byters against one another, partly by the Sidings of the  
 " People with some against the rest, partly by the too  
 " common Use of the Power of Ordinations in Presby-  
 " ters, by which they were more able to encrease their  
 " own Party, by ordaining those who wou'd join  
 " with them, and by this Means to perpetuate Schisms  
 " in the Church; upon this, when the wiser and gra-  
 " ver Sort consider'd the Abuses following the promif-  
 " cuous Use of this Power of Ordination; and withal,  
 " having in their Minds the excellent Frame of the  
 " Government of the Church under the Apostles, and  
 " their Deputies, and for preventing of future Schisms  
 " and Divisions among themselves, they unanimously  
 " agreed to choose one out of their Number, who  
 " was best qualified for the Management of so great a  
 " Trust, and to devolve the exercise of the Power of  
 " Ordination and Jurisdiction to him, yet so as that  
 " he act nothing of Importance, without the Consent  
 " and Concurrence of the Presbyters, who were still to  
 " be as the common Council to the Bishop. This I take  
 " to be the true and just Account of the Original of E-  
 " piscopacy in the Primitive Church according to *Jerome*.  
 " Again, *Petavius* (the Jesuit) from those Words of  
 " St. *Jerome*, *Philippi is a single Town of Macedonia; and*  
 " *truly in one City there cou'd not be* (as they are call'd)  
 " more

more Bishops, infers "That it may hence be evidently demonstrated, that *Jerome* believ'd, that Bishops and Presbyters were not one and the same Order even in the Age of the Apostles. For had he so believ'd, he had never said, there cou'd not be a Plurality of Bishops in one City, when surely there was a Plurality of Presbyters.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. 'Tis (quite contrary to what the Jesuit alleges) manifest that when *Jerome* saith, *There cou'd not be more Bishops than one (as they are call'd) in one City*; He speaks not of the Apostles Age but of his own, when the Name of Bishop was appropriated to one set over the rest of the Presbyters, and by his *Προσβια* or Presidency among 'em distinguish'd from the rest. But he is so far from supposing such a Distinction and Superiority establish'd in the Apostle's Age, that his next Paragraph is design'd to prove, that it was otherwise in the Apostolical Age, when the Church in the one City of Ephesus was govern'd not by one, but by a plurality of Bishops. So that we cannot admit the Jesuit's Inference from *Jerome's* Words, without making him guilty of the grossest Self-Contradiction, and even of Asserting and yet Disproving the same Thing in the same Breath. Whereas there is no Shadow of any such Self-repugnancy, if we understand him as speaking of his own Times, when such a Distinction between Bishop and Presbyters obtain'd in every Church as render'd it impossible, that the same Church shou'd at once have more than one Bishop to preside among the Presbyters in it.

Others catch at an Argument for the Divine Right of the Episcopal Superiority from these Words, *Wherefore as the Presbyters knew, that by the Custom of the Church, they are subject to their Præpositus or President, so let Bishops know that they are superior to Presbyters, rather by Custom than by any real Appointment of the Lord; and that they ought to rule the Church in common, imitating Moses, who when he might rule the People of Israel alone, chose Seventy with whom he might judge the People.* " Here (say they) as *Moses* did rule

" the



“ the People by a Divine Right, so *Jerome* supposes  
 “ that *Bishops* rule the Church by the same Right.

*Ans.* This Inference from *St. Jerome's* Words, has the same Disadvantage with the former, of making him guilty of a gross Self-contradiction. First, To deny the Superiority of *Bishops* above *Presbyters* to be of Divine Appointment, and to ascribe it to no higher Original than *Ecclesiastical Custom*, and then in the very next Words, to overthrow what he had said by recommending the Example of *Moses* to their Imitation. But *Jerome* is very easily reconcil'd with himself, if we suppose him to argue a *majori ad minus*. That if *Moses* to whose Government; the People of *Israel* were committed by God, did yet from a just Sense of the Difficulty of the Work, choose *Seventy Elders* to join with him in the Government, How much more does it become *Bishops* to rule the Church in common with *Presbyters*, whom only *Ecclesiastical Custom* has rais'd to a Superiority and Presidency among 'em, not any Divine Appointment. And thus *Jerome's* Sense is clear and consistent, and his Argument strong and forcible.

*Bellarmin*e and others argue from that Passage, “ But  
 “ that one was afterwards chosen who shou'd be set  
 “ above the rest, was done as a Remedy against Schism,  
 “ lest every one drawing the Church of Christ to himself  
 “ shou'd divide it. For at *Alexandria*, from *Mark* the E-  
 “ vangelist to *Heraclas* and *Dionysius* the Bishops there-  
 “ of, the *Presbyters* always nam'd one (chosen out of (or  
 “ by) themselves, and plac'd in a higher Degree) Bi-  
 “ shop; as if an Army shou'd make an Emperor, or  
 “ the Deacons shou'd choose one of themselves whom  
 “ they knew to be industrious, and call him Arch-  
 “ deacon. For what does a Bishop except Ordination  
 “ that a *Presbyter* cannot do?

From the former Part of this Paragraph, 'tis argu'd,  
 “ That since *St. Jerome* traces up this Episcopal Supe-  
 “ riority at *Alexandria*, as high as *Mark* the Evange-  
 “ list, he must suppose it to be of Apostolical Institu-  
 “ tion; and since he appropriates the Power of Ordi-  
 “ nation

“ tion to Bishops as distinguish’d from Presbyters, he  
 “ must suppose this peculiar Power to be of Divine  
 “ Right.” Nay some go so far as to infer, that he as-  
 scribes a *Monarchical Power* to Bishops in the Church,  
 by comparing ’em to those *Roman Emperors* whom their  
*Armies* chose.

*Ans.* How groundless these Inferences are, will  
 fully appear upon the following Considerations.

1. Nothing can be more absurd, than to suppose  
 that *Jerome* shou’d first produce the clear Testimonies  
 of the Apostles (*St. Paul*, *St. Peter*, and *St. John*,) con-  
 cerning the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter both in Name  
 and Office, and then make him overturn all he had  
 said, by ascribing the Superiority of Bishops to *Apostoli-  
 cal Institution*; when he himself had told us, *the  
 Churches were in the Apostle’s Time govern’d by the com-  
 mon Council of their Presbyters, who were the same with  
 Bishops*. And that afterwards one was chosen who  
 shou’d be set above the rest of the Presbyters, and that  
 this Superiority came in (*paulatim*) by little and little,  
 as *Schisms* and *Contentions* gave Occasion for it. This is  
 still to make him perfectly inconsistent with himself.

2. *St. Jerome* is so far from ascribing this Superiority  
 of Bishops above Presbyters at *Alexandria* it self to any  
*Apostolical Institution*, that he supposes the raising one  
 of the Presbyters above the rest, to be the voluntary Act  
 of the Presbyters themselves. It was they that chose one  
 out of their Number to preside over the rest, and appro-  
 priated the Name of Bishop to him, and it was their  
*Election* that gave him all the Superiority he had. As  
 when the *Roman Armies* chose their Emperors, they  
 had no other Power than what they received by  
 the Length of the Sword; and when the Deacons  
 chose their Archdeacon, they had no other (super-  
 ior) Power than what was meerly conferr’d by the  
 Choice of the Colledge of Deacons. Nay, we are told  
 by *Eutichius* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, in his *Origines Ec-  
 clesie Alexandrine*, publish’d in *Arabick* by our learned  
*Selden*, that the twelve Presbyters constituted by *Mark*,  
 upon

upon t  
 their M  
 Eleven  
 made  
 3. V  
 taining  
 Mark  
 as incl  
 to pla  
 zers in  
 for th  
 Churc  
 gypt.  
 the A  
 Matte  
 rome g  
 any  
 tary  
 that  
 from  
 ter  
 stance  
 differ  
 did  
 andri  
 ample  
 being  
 vent  
 this  
 Testi  
 4  
 Petar  
 Bisho  
 They  
 not  
 that  
 owing  
 Opin

upon the Vacancy of the See, did choose one out of their Number to be Head over the rest, and the other Eleven laid their Hands upon him and blessed him, and made him Patriarch. See *Stillingsf. Irenic.* p. 274.

3. When *Jerome* therefore speaks of this Custom obtaining in the Church of *Alexandria* from the Time of *Mark* the Evangelist, he cannot be reasonably supposed as including *Mark* the Evangelist himself; for he is said to plant that Church it self, and to constitute *Presbyters* in it; and was so far from being chosen by them for their *Bishop*, that he left 'em to plant other Churches in *Lybia*, *Marmorica*, and other Parts of *Agypt*. And no one will suppose that he cou'd derive the Authority of an Evangelist (or a *Bishop* either) as a Matter of Divine Right from their Choice. And *St. Jerome* gives not the least Intimation of *St. Mark's* having any Hand in this Constitution, but makes it the voluntary Act of the *Presbyters* themselves. All therefore that his Words can reasonably imply is, that this Custom begun very early at *Alexandria*, perhaps soon after *Mark* left them; for by making this a singular Instance, he rather intimates, that *Alexandria* herein differ'd from other Churches, among whom this Custom did not obtain so soon as it did there. So that *Alexandria* gave the first and most early Precedent and Example, which other Churches in some Time after follow'd; being by Dissentions led to this Remedy for the Prevention of them. And *St. Jerome* expressly affirms this to be after the Death of the Apostle *John*, whose Testimony he had immediately before cited.

4. For those Words of *St. Jerome* which *Bellarmino*, *Petavio*, and others so much insist on, For what does a Bishop except Ordination, which a *Presbyter* may not do? They plainly refer to the Times wherein *St. Jerome* liv'd, not to the Apostolical Age; and therefore cannot imply, that the appropriating this Power to the Bishop, was owing to any Apostolical Constitution in *St. Jerome's* Opinion. On the contrary, *St. Jerome* supposes *Timo-*  
thy



by himself to be ordain'd, by the laying on of the Hands  
 of Presbyters in the Apostles Time, in this very Epistle  
 to Evagrius, and makes that one of his Proofs, that Bi-  
 shops and Presbyters were the same in the Apostles Time, so  
 that without gross Self-contradiction, he cannot suppose  
 the Apostles to have appropriated this Power to Bishops as  
 then distinguish'd from Presbyters. Nay, in the Instance  
 of Alexandria it self, he supposes the Power of the Bishop  
 as President of the Presbytery, to be conferr'd by the  
 Presbyters themselves. And whereas a learned Doctor  
 pretends, that the Presbyters did only make Choice of  
 the Person, but the Ordination was perform'd by other  
 Bishops. Dr. Stillingfleet well replies, *Irenic.* p. 273.  
 " That learned Doctor (*saieth he*) shou'd tell us, First  
 " who and where those Bishops of *Ægypt* were, who  
 " did consecrate and ordain the Bishop of *Alexandria*  
 " after his Election by the Presbyters, especially while  
 " *Ægypt* remain'd but one Province, under the Go-  
 " vernment of the *Præfectus Augustalis*. Secondly, How  
 " this had been the least pertinent to St. *Jerome's* Pur-  
 " pose, to have made a particular Instance in the Church  
 " of *Alexandria*, for that which was common to all  
 " other Churches besides. Thirdly, This Election in  
 " *Jerome* must imply the conferring the Power and Au-  
 " thority by which the Bishop acted. For First, The  
 " setting up this Power is by *Jerome* attributed to  
 " this Choice, as appears by his Words, *But that after-*  
 " *wards one was chosen that shou'd be set above the rest,*  
 " *was done as a Remedy of Schism, lest every one draw-*  
 " *ing the Church of Christ to himself shou'd break it.*  
 " Whereby 'tis evident, that *Jerome* attributes the  
 " the first Original of that *exsors potestas* (as he calls it  
 " elsewhere) in the Bishop above Presbyters, not to  
 " any Apostolical Constitution, but to the free Choice  
 " of the Presbyters themselves, which does fully ex-  
 " plain what he means by *Consuetudo Ecclesie*, viz.  
 " that which came up by a voluntary Act of the Go-  
 " vernors themselves. Secondly, It appears that by  
 " Election

" Ele  
 " stan  
 The  
 That  
 was at  
 Presby  
 Presby  
 comme  
 which  
 Bishop  
 suppos  
 stolic  
 first bu  
 andria  
 And  
 dria ca  
 be any  
 mony  
 stituti  
 Ordin  
 doing  
 of Di  
 Ag  
 " nee  
 " Oro  
 " Suc  
 An  
 of the  
 sion t  
 they  
 distinc  
 only  
 from  
 tity o  
 Age,  
 to all  
 speak

" *Election* he means conferring Authority, by the In-  
 " stances he brings to that Purpose, &c.

The true Sense then of this Passage in St. *Jerome* is,  
 That as the Superiority of the *Bishop* above *Presbyters*,  
 was at first conferr'd on him by the voluntary Act of the  
*Presbyters* themselves, so even in his Time it self, the  
*Presbyters* did actually exercise all spiritual Powers in  
 common with the *Bishop*, except that of *Ordination*,  
 which was now by current Custom appropriated to the  
*Bishop*, as distinguish'd from 'em. But he is so far from  
 supposing this to be a Matter of *Divine Right* or *Apo-*  
*stolical Constitution*, that he supposes it *posterior* to the  
*first humane Constitution* of *Episcopacy* it self at *Alex-*  
*andria*.

And I may add, That unless the Church of *Alexan-*  
*dria* can be prov'd during the Two First Centuries to  
 be any more than a *Parochial Church*, even this Testi-  
 mony of *Jerome* can prove no more than the early In-  
 stitution of *Parochial Episcopacy*, and that as an *humane*  
*Ordinance*; which may be freely granted without  
 doing the least Service to the Cause of the *Divine Right*  
 of *Diocesan Episcopacy*.

Again, *Bellarmino* argues, " That St. *Jerome* must  
 " needs have own'd the *Divine Right* of the superior  
 " Order of *Bishops*, because he asserts *Bishops* to be all  
 " *Successors of the Apostles*.

*Ans.* That St. *Jerome* asserts *Bishops* to be *Successors*  
 of the *Apostles* is true, but that he asserts that Succes-  
 sion to be any *peculiar Privilege* belonging to 'em as  
 they are suppos'd to be by *Divine Right* an Order  
 distinct from *Presbyters*, is utterly false. 'Tis not  
 only contrary to the whole Scope of his Reasoning  
 from the Apostolical Writings, concerning the *Iden-*  
*tity* of the *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in the *Apostolical*  
*Age*, but from his expressly ascribing this Privilege  
 to all *Priests* in common. For having Occasion to  
 speak of the Clergy, without Distinction, he saith,

O

\* Far

“ \* Far be it from me to speak any Thing to the Disadvantage of those, who succeeding to the Degree of the Apostles consecrate the Body of the Lord with their sacred Mouth, by whom we are Christians, who having the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, do in some Measure represent the Day of Judgment; who preserve the Church of Christ in sober Chastity”. And a little after he saith, “ I ought not to sit before a Presbyter.” (it seems neither he nor Heliodorus were then ordain’d, tho’ they were both so afterwards) “ For he, if I offend, has Power to deliver me to Satan for the Destruction of the Flesh, that the Spirit may be sav’d in the Day of the Lord Jesus.” And indeed he that makes Bishop and Presbyter, the same by Divine Right could not in consistency with himself, do otherwise than make all Priests in the Christian World the Successors of the Apostles.

But the strongest Argument that Bellarmine makes Use of, is from those Words of Jerome. —

And that we may know, that the Apostolical Traditions are taken out of the Old Testament, what Aaron and his Sons, and the Levites were in the Temple, let Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons challenge to themselves in the Church. See before, p. 181. Hence he would infer, that Jerome supposes the Jewish Church to be the Model of the Christian, that as there were three Orders in the Jewish Church of High-Priest, and Priests, and Levites, so there must be three Orders in the Christian, viz. Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. And that all this is owing to Apostolical Tradition.

\* Absit ut de his quicquam finistum loquar : qui apostolico gradu succedentes, Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt : per quos & nos Christiani sumus. Qui claves regni coelorum habentes, quodammodo ante iudicii diem iudicant : qui sponsam Domini sobria castitate conservant. — Mihi ante Presbyterium sedere non licet : illi, si peccavero, licet tradere me Satanae in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit. Hieron. Ep. ad Heliodor. de laude vitae solitariae. Op. Tom. I. p. 1.

But



But Dr. *Stillington* has so fully answer'd this Argument when insisted on by Dr. *Hammond*, that I shall present it to the Reader in his own Words.

“ From these Words, (saith he, *Iren.* p. 265.) a  
 “ learned Doctor and strenuous Assertor of the *Jus Di-*  
 “ *vinum* of Prelacy, questions not but to make *Je-*  
 “ *rome* either apparently contradictory to himself, or  
 “ else to assert that the Superiority of Bishops above  
 “ Presbyters, was by his Confession an *Apostolical Tra-*  
 “ *dition*. For, saith he, *Nil manifestius dici potuit;*  
 “ and S. 2. *Quid ad hoc responderi possit, aut quo opo-*  
 “ *capudis artificio deliniri aut deludi tam diserta affirma-*  
 “ *tio, fateor ego me divinando assequi non posse; sed e-*  
 “ *contra ex iis quæ David Blondellus, quæ Walo, quæ Lu-*  
 “ *dov. Capellus hac in re præstiterunt, mihi persuasissimum*  
 “ *esse, nihil uspiam contra apertam lucem obtendi posse.*  
 “ In a Case then so desperate as poor *Jerome* lies in,  
 “ by a Wound he is suppos'd to have given himself,  
 “ when the Priest and the *Levite* hath pass'd him by, it  
 “ will be a Piece of Charity in our passing by the way  
 “ a little to consider his Case, to see whether there be  
 “ any Hopes of Recovery. We take it then for grant-  
 “ ed, that *Jerome* hath already said, that *Apostolus*  
 “ *perspicue docet eosdem esse Presbyteros quos & Episco-*  
 “ *pos*, in the same *Epistle*, which he proves there at  
 “ large; and in another Place, *sicut ergo Presbyteri*  
 “ *sciunt se ex Ecclesia consuetudine ei qui sibi præpositus*  
 “ *fuerit, esse subjectos, ita Episcopi noverint se magis*  
 “ *consuetudine quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate*  
 “ *Presbyteris esse majores, & in commune debere Ec-*  
 “ *clesiam regere.* The Difficulty now lies in the re-  
 “ conciling this with what is before cited out of  
 “ the same *Author*: Some solve it by saying, that  
 “ in *Jerome's* Sense, *Apostolical Tradition* and *Eccle-*  
 “ *siastical Custom* are the same; as *ad Mercellum*,  
 “ he saith, the Observation of *Lent* is *Apostolica*  
 “ *traditio*, and *advers. Luciferam* saith, it is *Eccle-*  
 “ *sia consuetudo*; so that by *Apostolical Tradition*, he  
 “ meant

meant not an *Apostolical Constitution*, but an *Ecclesiastical Custom*. And if *Jerome* speak according to the general Vogue, this Solution may be sufficient, notwithstanding what is said against it; for according to that common Rule of *Austin*, *Things that were generally in Use, and no certain Author assign'd of them, were attributed to the Apostles*. Two Things therefore I shall lay down for reconciling *Jerome* to himself: The first is, the Difference between *Traditio Apostolica* and *Traditio Apostolorum*; this latter doth indeed imply the Thing spoken of to have proceeded from the *Apostles* themselves, but the former may be applied to what was in Practice after the *Apostles* Times; and the Reason of it is, that whatever was done in the Primitive Church, suppos'd to be agreeable to *Apostolical Practice*, was call'd *Apostolical*. Thence the *Bishop's See* was call'd *Sedes Apostolica*, as *Tertullian* tells us, *ob consanguinitatem doctrinae*. So *Sidonius Apollinaris* calls the *See of Lupus* the *Bishop of Tricassium* in France, *Sedem Apostolicam*. And the *Bishops* of the Church were call'd *Viri Apostolici*, and thence the *Constitutions* which go under the *Apostles* Names were so call'd, saith *Albaspineus*, *ab Antiquitate, nam cum eorum aliquot ab Apostolorum successoribus (qui, Teste Tertulliano, Apostolici viri nominabantur) facti essent, Apostolicorum primum canones, deinde nonnullorum Latinorum ignorantia, aliquot literarum detractone, Apostolorum dicti sunt*. By which we see whatever was conceiv'd to be of any great Antiquity in the Church, tho' it was not thought to have come from the *Apostles* themselves, yet it was call'd *Apostolical*; so that in this Sense, *Traditio Apostolica* is no more than *traditio antiqua*, or *ab Apostolicis viris profecta*, which was meant rather of those that were conceiv'd to succeed the *Apostles*, than of the *Apostles* themselves. But I answer, Secondly, That granting *Traditio Apostolica* to mean *Traditio Apostolorum*, yet *Jerome* is far from contradicting himself, which is obvious to any that will read the

Words

“ Words before, and consider their coherence. The  
 “ Scope and Drift of his Epistle, is to chastise the Ar-  
 “ rogance of one who made *Deacons* superior to Pres-  
 “ byters. *Audio quendam in tantam erupisse vecordiam,*  
 “ *ut Diaconos Presbyteris i. e. Episcopis anteferreret,* and  
 “ so spends a great Part of the *Epistle* to prove that a  
 “ *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are the same, and at last brings  
 “ in these Words, giving the Account why *Paul* to *Ti-*  
 “ *mothy* and *Titus* mentions no *Presbyters*, *Quia in Epis-*  
 “ *copo & Presbyter continetur, aut igitur ex Presbytero*  
 “ *ordinetur Diaconus, ut Presbyter minor Diacono compro-*  
 “ *betur, in quem crescat ex parvo, aut si ex Diacono or-*  
 “ *dinatur Presbyter, noverit se lucris minorem, sacerdotio*  
 “ *esse majorem.* And then presently adds, *& ut scia-*  
 “ *mus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri testamento,*  
 “ *quod Aaron & filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fue-*  
 “ *runt, hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri atque Diaconi ven-*  
 “ *dicent in Ecclesiâ.* Is it imaginable that a Man who  
 “ had been proving all along the Superiority of a Pres-  
 “ byter above a Deacon by his Identity with a Bishop in  
 “ the Apostles Times, shou’d at the same Time say,  
 “ that a Bishop was above a Presbyter by the Apostles In-  
 “ stitution, and so directly overthrow all he had been  
 “ saying before? Much as if one shou’d go about to  
 “ prove, that the *Præfectus urbis* and the *Curatores ur-*  
 “ *bis* in *Alexander Severus* his Time were the same  
 “ Office, and to that End shou’d make use of the Consti-  
 “ tution of that Emperor, whereby he appointed four-  
 “ teen *Curatores urbis*, and set the *Præfectus* in an Of-  
 “ fice above them. Such an Incongruity is scarce in-  
 “ cident to a Man of very ordinary Esteem for Intel-  
 “ lectuals, much less to such a one as *Jerome* is reputed  
 “ to be. The plain Meaning then of *Jerome* is no  
 “ more but this, that as *Aaron* and his Sons in the Or-  
 “ der of Priesthood were above the *Levites* under the  
 “ Law; so the *Bishops* and *Presbyters* in the Order of the  
 “ *Evangelical Priesthood* are above the *Deacons* under the  
 “ Gospel. For the Comparison runs not between *Aa-*  
 “ *ron* and his Sons under the Law, and *Bishops* and Pres-



“ byters under the Gospel, but between *Aaron* and his  
 “ Sons as one Part of the Comparison under the Law,  
 “ and the *Levites* under them as the other; so un-  
 “ der the Gospel *Bishops* and *Presbyters* make one  
 “ Part of the Comparison answering to *Aaron* and his  
 “ Sons, in that wherein they all agree, viz. the Order  
 “ of *Priesthood*; and the other Part under the Gospel is  
 “ that of *Deacons*, answering to the *Levites* under the  
 “ Law. The Opposition is not then in the Power of  
 “ Jurisdiction between *Bishops* and *Priests*, but between  
 “ the same Power of Order, which is alike both in *Bi-*  
 “ shops and *Presbyters* (according to the Acknowledg-  
 “ ment of all) to the Office of *Deacons*, which stood  
 “ in Competition with them. Thus I hope we have left  
 “ *Jerome* in perfect Harmony with himself, notwith-  
 “ standing the Attempt made to make him so palpa-  
 “ bly contradict himself.

These being the principal Arguments us'd to elude  
 the clear Testimony of *St. Jerome*, 'tis scarce worth the  
 while to take Notice of the broken Scraps from that *Author*  
 that are made use of to countenance this Preten-  
 sion of a *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*, as a distinct Or-  
 der from that of *Presbyters*. And therefore I shall con-  
 tent my self with a few short Remarks on Two of the  
 most plausible of them.

Thus some conclude, That *St. Jerome* must have be-  
 liev'd the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*, because in his  
*Catalogue* of *Bishops* he mentions *St. James* as the first  
*Bishop* of *Jerusalem*.

To this Objection the learned *Junius* justly replies,  
 by shewing, that the common Reading of that Place  
 in *Jerome's* *Catalogue* is corrupted; and that as *St. James*  
 resided at *Jerusalem* as an *Apostle*, so *Jerome* (after the  
 Manner of the Ancients) speaks of the *Apostles* in the  
 Style of his own Times, giving *St. James* the Title  
 of *Bishop* on the Account of that *Presidency* among the  
 Elders of that Church, that belong'd to him on the Ac-  
 count of his *Apostolical* Character and Authority. This  
 ought not therefore to be so understood, as to contra-

dict

dict what he so professedly declares to be his Judgment concerning the Scriptural *Bishops* and *Presbyters* being the same both in *Name* and *Office*.

Dr. *Pearson* objects St. *Jerome's* calling the Office of a *Deacon* the *Third Degree*. *Ep. ad Heliod.*

To this the same Answer may be return'd, That in that he speaks only according to the Style of his own Age. For when he expounds *1 Tim. III.* and *1 Tit.* he manifestly asserts the Office of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* to be the same, and cou'd not therefore without gross Self-contradiction, by calling that of *Deacons* a *Third Degree* intend, that the Apostle himself had made Two Orders or Degrees of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*: But there being a Difference of Degree in his Age, between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, he calls the *Deacon-ship* a *Third Degree*, according to the common Language of the Time wherein he liv'd, which he supposes in this Point to have receded from the Custom and Practice of the Apostolical Age. Not to mention, That this Epistle to *Heliodorus* was wrote in his younger Years, when himself was not ordain'd a *Presbyter*; whereas the Passages I have cited before, contain his Judgment in his riper Years. Nay in that very Epistle (as I have shewn before) he makes all *Priests* Successors to the Degree of *Apostles*, and therefore cou'd not make *Bishop* and *Presbyter* Two distinct Degrees by Divine Institution, without supposing Two different Orders and Degrees among the *Apostles* themselves.

I shall conclude what relates to St. *Jerome's* Judgment, with that judicious Remark of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, *Irenic.* p. 277. " Among all the fifteen Testimonies " produc'd by a learned Writer out of *Jerome* for the " Superiority of *Bishops* above *Presbyters*, I cannot find " one that does found it upon Divine Right, but only " on the Conveniency of such an Order, for the Peace " and Unity of the Church of God. Which is his " Meaning in that Place, most produc'd to this Purpose, " *Ecclesiæ salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui* " *si non exors quædam, & ab omnibus eminens detur po-* " *testas,*

“ *testas, tot in Ecclesijs efficientur Schismata quot Sa-*  
 “ *cerdotes.* Where nothing can be more evident than  
 “ that he wou’d have some supereminent Power attri-  
 “ buted to the Bishop, for the Prevention of Schisms in  
 “ the Church. But granting some Passages may have  
 “ a more favourable Aspect towards the *Superiority* of  
 “ *Bishops* above *Presbyters* in his other Writings, I  
 “ wou’d feign know whether a Man’s Judgment must  
 “ be taken from *occasional* and *incidental* Passages, or  
 “ from *designed* or *set Discourses*? Which is as much  
 “ as to ask, whether the lively Representation of a  
 “ Man by Picture may be best taken, when in haste of  
 “ other Business he passes by us, giving only a Glance  
 “ of his Countenance; or when he purposely and de-  
 “ signedly sits in Order to that End, that his Counte-  
 “ nance may be truly represented?

The Truth is, This Testimony of St. *Jerome* has so  
 perplexed the Papal Defenders of the *Divine Right* of  
 the *Hierarchy*, that *Medina*, *Alphonsus de Castro*, and  
*Benedictus Justinianus* and others, give him up, and are  
 forc’d to own, that his Judgment was herein the same  
 with that of *Aerius*, tho’ he did not as *Aerius* proceed  
 to any Separation on the Account of it. And *Bellar-*  
*mine* after all the Pains he has taken to elude his Testi-  
 mony, does at last pretend him to be *unstable* and *Self-*  
*contradictory*. But upon how slight and unjust Grounds  
 he advances that Charge against him, we have already  
 seen. And ’tis very observable, that in that very Age  
 wherein *Episcopacy* in many of the larger Cities begun  
 to swell beyond the *Parochial* Bounds, and Ambition  
 begun to make more sensible Advances in the Church,  
 we shou’d have so clear and full a Testimony to the  
*Identity* of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in the *Apostolical Age*;  
 and so just an Account of the *Superiority* of *Bishops* ha-  
 ving its rise from *Ecclesiastical Custom*, and not from  
*Divine Appointment*. And herein St. *Austin* his Con-  
 temporary was of the same Mind, when he asserts the  
*Superiority* of *Bishops* above *Presbyters*, to be according to  
 the Name of Honour which the Custom of the Church had

then  
1801

then br  
la que  
major

HA  
celebra  
make a  
the tru  
disting  
Right.

As  
pear,  
byter o  
the Cl  
to it,  
tested

If  
the F  
perior  
in the  
this  
The  
was r  
bers v  
copal  
longi  
that  
rally  
Citie  
appe  
roch  
ing  
to it  
far  
(eve  
app  
all  
at o  
fair



then brought in. *Quaquam secundum honorum vocabula quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopus Presbytero major sit, &c.* Ep. 19. ad Hieron.

HAVING gone thro' the Testimonies of the most celebrated Writers of the Three First Centuries, I shall make a few Reflexions on 'em in order to the clearing the true State of the Controversy. And here I shall distinctly consider *Matter of Fact*, and *Matter of Right*.

As to *Matter of Fact*, I think it does sufficiently appear, that no such Distinction between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* obtain'd in the *Apostle's* Time; nor had obtain'd in the Church of *Corinth* when *Clemens* wrote his *Epistle* to it, which seems to be the most valuable and uncontested Monument of Primitive Antiquity.

If the *Epistles* of *Ignatius* publish'd by *Vossius* from the *Florentine Copy* be genuine, 'tis certain that some *Superiority* of a *Bishop* above *Presbyters* had then obtain'd in the *Eastern Churches*; but then 'tis as certain, that this *Episcopacy* was only *Congregational* or *Parochial*. The *Bishop's Church* for the Two First Centuries at least was no larger than a *single Congregation*, whose Members were capable of *Personal Communion*, and each *Episcopal Church* had but one *Altar* or *Communion-Table* belonging to it. Nor does there appear any Evidence, that *Episcopal Churches* did in the Third Century generally exceed those Bounds. And even in such Great Cities as *Rome* and *Alexandria*, the *Episcopal Church* appears not to be larger than one of our *over-grown Parochial Churches*, that has several *Chappels of Ease* belonging to it, nor perhaps to have more Members belonging to it than some large *Parishes* in *London*. But for the far greatest Part of *Episcopal Churches* in that Age, (even *St. Cyprian's Church* at *Carthage* not excepted) they appear to be no larger than such *Parochial* ones, where all the Members of it are capable of joining together at once in all Acts of Publick Worship, and in all Affairs that related to the Government of those Churches.

And

And for the Truth of this I appeal to the full Evidence that has been laid before the Reader.

I also freely grant as to *Matter of Fact*, that when the great increase of Christians did towards the End of the Third, and in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, occasion the setting up of several distinct Assemblies or Congregations in the greater Cities distinct from the *Original* or *Mother Church*, the *Bishops* did keep them still in a Dependence on, and Subjection to their Authority; and as to that, the Dispute is not about *Matter of Fact*, but *Matter of Right*. And tho' this was the first Step towards setting up *Diocesan* or *Provincial* Episcopacy, yet while the Communion of those Christians, that attended these *lesser Assemblies* in the Lord's-Supper, was confin'd to the *Bishop's Altar* or *Communion-Table*, those *Episcopal Churches* were no more than those very large *Parochial* ones among us, that have a considerable Number of *Chappels of Ease* belonging to 'em, while all the *Parishioners* are oblig'd to be *Communicants* in the *Parish-Church*. And therefore as to *Matter of Fact*, I shall freely allow what *Bishop Stillingfleet* saith in his *Sermon against Separation*, "That tho' when the Churches increas'd, the Occasional Meetings were frequent in several Places, yet still there was but *One Church* and *One Altar*, and *One Baptistry*, and *One Bishop* with many *Presbyters* assisting him. Which (saith he) is so plain in Antiquity as to the Churches planted by the Apostles themselves, that none but a great Stranger to the History of the Church can call it in Question." I here suppose the Bishop means only, that the Churches planted by the Apostles themselves, had each of 'em but *One Altar* and *One Baptistry*. For if he intend here to assert, that those Churches had in the Apostles Time other *subordinate Congregations*, or had then *One Bishop* as a distinct Officer from the *Presbyters*, I take the former Part of the Assertion to be fully confuted from the Account we have of the Two First Centuries, which mention no Churches that exceeded the Bounds of *single Congregations*; and the latter Part of it

to be directly contradictory both to the *Apostle*, and to the Judgment of St. *Jerome*, concerning the Practice of the *Apostolical Age*. And he adds, " 'Tis true, after some Time in the greater Cities, they had distinct Places allotted, and Presbyters fix'd among 'em. and such *Allotments* were call'd *Tituli* at *Rome*, and *Lauræ* at *Alexandria*, and *Parishes* in other Places. But these were never thought then to be new Churches, or to have any independent Government in themselves, but were all in subjection to the Bishop and his Colledge of *Presbyters*; of which multitudes of Examples might be brought from the most authentick Testimonies of Antiquity, if a Thing so evident needed any Proof at all. And yet this Distribution even in *Cities*, was look'd on as so uncommon in those elder Times, that *Epiphanius* takes Notice of it as an extraordinary Thing at *Alexandria*; and therefore 'tis probably suppos'd that there was no such Thing in all the Cities of *Crete* in his Time.

I come now to consider *Matter of Right*. And here I wou'd observe.

1. That the Superiority of these Primitive Congregational or Parochial Bishops above their Presbyters, does no way appear to be of *Divine Right* from any Thing that occurs in the Writings of the *New Testament*. (As I shall more fully shew in the following Discourse in Confirmation of what Mr. B—— has already offer'd in the *Postscript*.) And St. *Jerome* does most expressly ascribe it to no higher Original than the Custom of the Church, disclaiming any *Divine Institution* for it, and owning, that it came in gradually after the *Apostolical Age* by a general Agreement, as a Remedy against Schisms.

2. Much less is it of *Divine Right*, when a single Congregation was planted in any City or Town (consisting of the Christians then living in the City and the Villages about it) and was under the Government of a Bishop and Presbyters, like our *Parish-Rector* and his Curates, that upon such an Increase of Converts as render'd



der'd it necessary to erect more *Congregations*, all those *new-erected Congregations* were to have no *Bishop* and *Presbyters* of their own, but were to be perpetually subject to the *Bishop* of the *Original* or *Mother-Church*. This is no more of *Divine Right*, than 'tis of *Divine Right*, that when a *Parish* comes to have too many *Inhabitants* for one *Congregation*, all the other *Congregations* to be erected in it, must be only *Chappels of Ease* or *Oratories* to the first *Parish-Church*, supplied by meer *Curates*. Whereas a *Division* of one over-grown *Parish-Church* into two or three more under their several *Parish-Rectors*, wou'd be much more agreeable to the *Pattern* of the *Apostolical* and truly *Primitive Churches*, and much more conducive to the *Edification* of the *People*.

3. Much less is it of *Divine Right*, That the *Government* of all the *Parochial Churches* in a whole *Province* or *Shire* (or perhaps several *Shires*) under their *Parochial Bishops* shou'd be put down, and engross'd into the *Hands* of one *Provincial* or *Diocesan Bishop*. And that these *Parochial Bishops* shou'd only turn *Curates* to such a *Diocesan*; much less is it of *Divine Right*, that these *Parochial Bishops* shou'd be divested of all that *Share* in the *Government* of the *Church*, which even the *Primitive Parish-Presbyters* had. And that all *Ecclesiastical Discipline* shou'd be reserv'd to the *Diocesan's Court*; and least of all, that the *Exercise* of it shou'd be delegated to a *Lay-Chancellor*, and other *Officials* of that *Court*, that are not so much as vested with any proper *Ecclesiastical Authority*.

We may therefore from the *Premises* relating to *Antiquity*, infer in *Reference* to the subject of this *Controversy*.

1. That if we may believe *St. Jerome*, this *Parochial Episcopacy* is only of *Ecclesiastical Custom*, not of *Divine Appointment*.

2. That shou'd we grant, that *Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Cyprian*, and such other *Writers* in the *Three First Centuries*, did not only own such a *Parochial Episcopacy*, but believ'd it to be

be of D  
tution.  
sted wi  
nication  
to a D  
copacy  
cannot  
cbial B  
in orde  
Power i  
3. W  
formity  
the Pri  
copacy

The  
gle, the  
of a D  
thro' or  
coln is  
cbial  
or Floc  
his Li  
minati  
The S  
not on  
Thing  
frage  
by ne  
san or  
Bishop

The  
truster  
his Ep  
and w  
verse  
Bishop  
under  
Dioc  
or kn

be of *Divine Right*, or even to be a *Laudable Constitution*. Because as the *Parochial Bishop* was then vested with all the *Spiritual Powers* (such as *Excommunication* and *Ordination*) that are now appropriated to a *Diocesan* or *Provincial Bishop*, so if *Parochial Episcopacy* be of *Divine Institution*, *Diocesan Episcopacy* cannot be so. For some Scores or Hundreds of such *Parochial Bishops* must be divested of these *Spiritual Powers*, in order to the setting up *one Diocesan Bishop*. And his Power is plainly destructive of theirs.

3. We may hence see, That there is little or no Conformity between the Government of the Church under the *Primitive Parochial* and the present *Diocesan Episcopacy*.

The Charge of a *Primitive Parochial Bishop* was a single, tho' often numerous Congregation; but the Charge of a *Diocesan one*, is no less than all the Congregations thro' one or more large Counties. (The Diocess of *Lincoln* is said to have 1100 of 'em.) The *Primitive Parochial Bishop* was chosen by the *Suffrages* of his *People* or *Flock*, who are supposed personally acquainted with his *Life* and *Manners*, as well as *Abilities*. The *Nomination* of *Diocesan Bishops* is usually in the *Prince*, The *Shadow* of an *Election* in the *Dean* and *Chapter*, not one in many Hundred of his *Flock* knowing any Thing of the *Matter*, and none having any *decisive Suffrage* at all in it. The *Primitive Bishop* was ordain'd by neighbouring *Parochial Bishops*; the present *Diocesan ones* are consecrated by such *County* or *Province-Bishops*, as the *Primitive Ages* knew nothing of.

The *Primitive Parochial Bishop* reckon'd himself entrusted with the particular *Souls* of all that belong'd to his *Episcopal Church* or *Flock*, and accountable for 'em; and was therefore suppos'd capable of a *Personal Converse* with 'em and *Inspection* over 'em. But no *Diocesan Bishop* that makes Conscience of what he does, wou'd undertake such a particular Care of all the *Souls* in his Diocess, when 'tis not possible he shou'd be able to inspect or know one of a Hundred, not to say one of a Thousand

land of 'em. Nor do I find, that they think themselves oblig'd thereto.

The Primitive *Parochial Bishop* sat with his *Presbyters* in the same Congregation, and ordinarily perform'd the usual Offices of Religion every *Lord's-Day*, while they were present (as *Preaching, Praying, Administring the Lord's-Supper,*) the *Presbyters* only performing 'em either in the *Bishops* occasional *Absence*, or with his *Allowance* when present. But shoud all the *Presbyters* of the *Diocess* be every *Lord's-Day* with the *Bishop*, what wou'd become of their neglected and desolate Congregations?

The Primitive *Parochial Bishop* ordinarily exercis'd no Act of Ecclesiastical Discipline, but in the Presence and with the Consent and Concurrence of his *Presbyters*, none being excluded. Nay, he pass'd the highest *Censures* of the Church always in the Presence of his *Flock*, and according to their *Mind* and *Judgment*, as well as that of the *Presbyters*. But 'tis impossible, that the whole *Diocesan Church*, or any considerable Part of it, can be present at such *Consultations*, can hear such *Causes* debated, or give their Opinion concerning 'em; nor indeed cou'd the *Presbyters* of the *Diocess* attend the *Bishops* Court to join in such *Censures* (supposing the strictness of the ancient Discipline restor'd) without neglecting the Care of their particular Congregations, nor can one *Bishop* hear the *Causes* of all the scandalous *Church-Members* in a *County* or *Province* if they were brought before him.

The Primitive *Parochial Bishop* never delegated his Chief (tho' not *Sole*) Power in inflicting Church-Censures to any other Person, much less to a *Layman*. But Dr. Burnet tells us, " That our Ecclesiastical Courts are  
 " not in the Hands of our Bishops and their Clergy, but  
 " put over to the Civilians, where too often Fees are  
 " more strictly look'd after than the Correction of Man-  
 " ners.—Excommunication is become a kind of secu-  
 " lar Sentence, and is hardly now consider'd as a Spi-  
 " ritual Censure, being judg'd and given out by Lay-

men

" men  
 " rate  
 " (Dr  
 " mat  
 By  
 (the t  
 that P  
 over t  
 below  
 ther c  
 fiafica  
 sult or  
 subje  
 Chanc  
 puted  
 Name  
 (as we  
 No  
 impor  
 Parock  
 tween  
 to arg  
 a bare  
 Confor  
 Gover  
 Mank  
 We ar  
 that v  
 from  
 from  
 Office  
 Gentl  
 being  
 byters  
 Charg  
 only  
 incom



“ men, and often upon Grounds which to speak moderately do not Merit so severe and dreadful a Sentence.  
 “ (Dr. Burnet's Pref. to 2d Vol. of the Hist. of the Reformation.)

By the present *Diocesan Model*, all the *Parish-Rectors* (the true *Primitive Bishops*) are not only deprived of that *Pastoral Authority* that the *Primitive Bishops* had over their Flocks, but reduc'd to a Degree of *Subjection* below that of the *Primitive Presbyters*. For they neither concur with the *Bishop* in the Passing of the *Ecclesiastical Censures*: Nor does he so much ordinarily as consult or advise with 'em concerning 'em; nay they are subjected to the *Jurisdiction* and *Censures* of those *Lay-Chancellors* that have the *Diocesan Bishop's* Authority deputed to 'em, and who tho' they always act in his Name, do not always act even with the *Bishop's* Leave, (as we may see in *Bishop Bedell's* Case.)

Now when there is so essential a Difference in such important *Instances* as these, between the *Primitive Parochial* and the present *Diocesan* Episcopacy, and between the *Government* of the one and that of the other, to argue from the bare Name of *Bishop* and *Presbyters*, and a bare *Superiority* of the former above the latter, for a *Conformity* between the present and the *primitive Church-Government*, is but to impose on the unthinking Part of Mankind, by a weak but fallacious way of Arguing. We are unjustly charg'd with *Sophistry*, under Pretence, that we argue for the *Bishop* and *Presbyters* being the same from a meer *Community of Names*; whereas we argue from their *Qualifications* and *Characters*, their *Work* and *Office* being the same as well as their *Names*. But these Gentlemen argue for the *Diocesan Bishop* and *Clergy* being the same with the *Primitive Bishop* and his *Presbyters*, from a meer *Community of Names*, when their *Charge*, their way of *Government*, their *Offices* are not only very different, but as I have shewn inconsistent and incompatible.

4. We may hence see, That those Reformed Churches that want the *Diocesan* Form of Government, do yet retain the true primitive *Parochial* Episcopacy.

Every one of their Churches has its *Bishop* and *Deacons*, and in their numerous Churches, the *Bishop* has usually one or more *Collegues*. 'Tis true, these *Collegues* that assist the first Pastor of the Church are not reckon'd of any *distinct* Office from him; nor has he any other *Superiority* over 'em than what Difference of *Age* or *Abilities* may entitle him to. And in this, they come nearer to the Simplicity of the *Apostolical* Age, when there was no such *inequality* among the *Presbyter-Bishops*; and when particular Churches had no other *Officers* (as St. *Clemens* tells us) than *Bishops* and *Deacons*. For these *Subject-Presbyters* they do with St. *Jerome* ascribe the rise of 'em to *Ecclesiastical Custom*, not to *Divine Appointment*. But all that officiate as *Pastors* in their Churches, have all *Spiritual Powers* by their *Ordination* convey'd to 'em, and do accordingly exercise 'em in their several Flocks according to the Model of the Primitive *Parochial* Churches. And these *Parochial Bishops* of theirs are so far from setting up *Independency*, (in any criminal Sense of that Word) that they are as much for all the regular *Associations* of neighbouring *Parochial Bishops*, in order to the Preservation of *Concord* and *Harmony*, *Order* and *Peace*, as those *Primitive Bishops* were. As we may see in the *Conformity between the Discipline of the Reformed Churches of France*, and that of the ancient Church wrote by the learned *Monsieur L'Arroque*. I confess many of the *Reformed Churches* have a Sort of *Elders*, that are not the same with the *Presbyters* of the Primitive Church, because the latter were properly ordain'd to the sacred Office of the *Ministry*, and empower'd thereby to *baptize*, *preach* and *administer the Sacraments*, when desir'd by the *Parochial Bishop*, whose *Curates* they were. But even these very *Elders* in the *Reformed Churches* do very well answer to the *Seniores Plebis*, that were distinct from the *Presbyters*, and were of laudable Use in the Primitive Church, (as

Blondell

Blonde  
gimine

And  
in the  
the Pr  
form'd  
tive C  
'em th  
in the  
Where  
Sort o  
at leas  
And t  
shops)  
Mr. D  
ly as  
suppor  
Now t  
of the  
any T  
tropol  
all the

5.  
lies ab

For  
had sh  
ly Scr  
little  
first an  
entirel  
see, th  
Institu  
restor  
for Pe  
for Di  
trusts  
Office  
what v  
Non-C

Blondell has fully shewn in his Book *De jure Plebis in regimine Ecclesiastico*.)

And I may add, That the *Ordinations* of such Pastors in the Reformed Churches, are truly *Episcopal ones* in the Primitive Sense of that Expression. They are perform'd by true *Parochial Bishops*, such as the Primitive Churches had, and usually by a greater Number of 'em than the ancient *Canons* made necessary, and that in the *Presence* and with the *Consent* of the *People*: Whereas the *Diocesan Ordinations* are perform'd by a Sort of *Bishop* that was unknown in the Two First Ages at least, and I think I may say in the *Third Century* too. And tho' with us some *Parish-Rectors* (the *Primitive Bishops*) join therein with the *Diocesan Bishop*; yet Mr. Dr—— and others of his Stamp tell us, 'tis meerly as *Approvers* of the *Bishop's Act*, by which alone he supposes the *Office convey'd* to the Person ordain'd. Now these *Ordinations* are not the *Episcopal Ordinations* of the *Primitive Church*. The first Thing that looks any Thing like 'em was, when the *Bishop* of the *Metropolis* first claim'd a chief Hand in the *Ordination* of all the *Parochial Bishops* within such a *Province*.

5. We may hence see, That the main Controversy lies about the *Extent* of the *Bishop's Charge*.

For the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy* Mr. B. had shewn, that there is no Ground for it from the Holy Scriptures; and I have now shewn, that there is as little from the Judgment of the Primitive Church in its first and purest Ages. For *Parochial Episcopacy*, we do entirely own the *Divine Right* of it; only we cannot see, that these *Subject-Presbyters* are properly of *Divine Institution*. But as to that, if the *Parish-Rectors* were restor'd to their true *Episcopal Power*, we shou'd easily for Peace Sake allow of these *Curate-Presbyters*: Nay for *Diocesan Bishops* themselves, so far as the Prince intrusts 'em with Power to perform what belongs to his Office *circâ sacra*, as he is *Custos utriusque Tabula*, 'tis what we shou'd not much object against. Nor did the *Non-Conformist Divines* at the *Savoy-Conference* oppose the



*Diocesan* Bishop's having some superintendency over the *Parochial Bishops* as *General Visitors*, provided their Power were only *cumulative* to, and not *destructive* of the Power of the *Primitive Parochial Bishops*. Nor did they object against their being during Life *Moderators* of *Diocesan Synods*, (according to *Archbishop Usher's Model*.) But 'tis the depriving the *Parish-Rectors* (the *Primitive Bishops*) of their governing Power over their Flocks, and the engrossing it for so large a District into one *Hand*, (when we think that the most judicious and laborious Pastor wou'd find Work enough to do in governing his own Flock; so that where 'tis monopoliz'd into one Hand, it must in a great Measure be left undone;) and 'tis the deputing the Exercise of one of the highest Ecclesiastical Powers, *viz.* that of *Excommunication* to Laymen, that appears to us in the present Model of *Diocesan Government*, wholly disconformable to the Pattern of the *Primitive Church*. And this we not only despair of seeing any *Divine Right* produc'd for, but cannot regard it as any other than a manifest *Deviation* from the Simplicity of the *Primitive Church-Government*, and inconsistent with that *Primitive Episcopacy*, that is vainly alledg'd to countenance and support it. And indeed till this Account of the *Primitive Episcopacy* be disprov'd, we must beg Leave to think, that those are the truest Friends of it, and most zealous for its *Restoration*, who are now run down on all Occasions as perverse *Enemies* to it; and those that make the greatest Noise in crying it up, are the very Persons that truly oppose it, and wou'd with the utmost Scorn and Violence obstruct any Attempts for the Revival of it. In short, if the *Primitive Episcopacy* was only *Parochial*, the Cause of *Diocesan Episcopacy* must be given up as to any Pretension of *Primitive Antiquity*, and much more as to any Pretension of *Divine Right*.

REMARKS

## REMARKS on CHAP. III.

HAVING gone thro' Mr. Dr ———'s *Testimonies*, I now proceed to his Third Chapter, wherein he proposes to shew, that there are *Three Ministerial Acts* that are by *Scripture* and *Antiquity* appropriated to *Bishops* as a distinct Order from *Presbyters*, viz. *Confirmation*, *Excommunication* and *Ordination*, from whence he pretends to prove the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*, as an Order distinct from and superior to that of *Presbytery*.

Before I enter on the particular Examination of what he has offer'd, I must here premise, that if Mr. Dr ——— would defend the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan* Episcopacy, he ought to prove that these *Powers* of *Excommunication*, *Confirmation* and *Ordination*, are by *Scripture* and *Antiquity* appropriated to such a *Bishop* as has many *Churches* or *Congregations* under his Government. For we never doubted but every *Bishop* or *Pastor* of a particular Church is vested with these *Powers*, and 'tis their being depriv'd thereof, and these *Powers* being engross'd into the Hands of a *Diocesan*, that we think has no Countenance either from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. But however, let us see what he has offer'd on this Head.

He begins with *Excommunication*.

As to this he tells us, " That it was appropriated to the *Apostles* while they were alive, or such as they plac'd in particular Churches to rule in their stead. He tells us, none join'd with St. Paul in the Excommunication of *Alexander* and *Hymeneus*, whom he deliver'd to Satan; this he tells us was the Case of the incestuous *Corinthian*, who was excommunicated by St. Paul without any other Assistance. And whereas Mr. B. had told him, that the Apostle blames the *Teachers* of the Church of *Corinth* for not excommunicating

municating the incestuous Person, he tells us from 1 Cor. V. 3, 4, 5 — “ That the *Apostle* alone pass’d the “ Sentence of *Excommunication* upon him by delivering “ him up to Satan, and order’d <sup>em</sup> to assemble, that “ the Sentence might be made publick.

*Answ.* That the *Apostles* appropriated this Power of *Excommunication* to themselves while alive, is an utterly groundless Assertion. That they committed it to such *Presbyter-Bishops* as they constituted in particular Churches (such as those of *Ephesus*, *Philippi*, *Corinth*, &c.) is what we freely own : But that they ever appropriated this Power to one single Person for all the Churches of a Province, is what Mr. Dr — I shou’d prove indeed, if he wou’d defend his Cause ; but what I believe when he comes to try he’ll absolutely despair of.

But as to this Case of the *Incestuous Corinthian*, Mr. Dr — is so far from answering the Argument Mr. B. had us’d, that he does not so much as consider where the Force of it lies.

The Charge that Mr. B. supposes given by the Apostle to the Teachers of the Church of Corinth, to excommunicate the *Incestuous Person*, is not contain’d at all in the 3, 4, 5 v. where he looks for it, but in the 7 v. where the Apostle requires <sup>em</sup> to purge out the old Leaven, that they may be made a new Lump ; and especially at v. 12 and 13. Do not ye judge them that are within ? But them that are without God judgeth ; therefore put away from among your selves that wicked Person. And if he’ll consult the learned Dr. *Whitby’s* Commentary, he’ll find, ’tis in these Passages that the Apostle speaks of the Sentence of *Excommunication*, and supposes at v. 12. That they had a Power to judge those that were within, and were Members of their Body or Society, which Power of Judging he therefore requires <sup>em</sup> to exercise, by casting out that wicked Person, and thereby purging out that old (or sour) Leaven from among <sup>em</sup>. And that he was actually excommunicated by them, seems plain from what the Apostle in his

Second

Second  
the Pu

[Emm]

[and]

by doe

by all

their

fettled

perform

that t

was no

tled :

for his

ry Teac

1 Cor.

contra

’em, t

had fu

Pastors

of the

and ye

bation

in the

But

prove,

passing

stuous

refer t

said lea

“ of a

“ Mir

“ to Sa

“ Pun

“ Pow

“ culor

“ plin

“ to t

“ scrib

“ bis S



Second Epistle speaks of this *Censure*, when he calls it the *Punishment inflicted on him by many*—2 Cor. II. v. 6.

[Ἐπιμὴ αὐτῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν πλείονων :] Not [ἔσθ] *before*, but [ὑπὸ] *by many*. I am not concern'd in what Dr. *Whitby* does here contend for, that the *Censure* was inflicted by *all* the *Members* of that Church; and he supposes their Case *singular*, because they had then no ordinary settled *Governors* or *Pastors*; but Divine Offices were perform'd among 'em by *Prophets*. And therefore, that this *Practice* of the *People's* inflicting such *Censures* was not to continue, when *Bishops* and *Pastors* were settled: But I must confess, that I see no Ground at all for his Supposition, that that Church wanted its *ordinary Teachers*. I am sure what the Apostle saith to 'em, 1 Cor. XII. 28, 29. v. seems more strongly to imply the contrary. Besides had there been only *Prophets* among 'em, they who are nam'd next to *Apostles* IV. *Ephes.* 11. had sure an Authority equal to that of any succeeding *Pastors* or *Bishops*; and therefore the *Authoritative Exclusion* of the *Incestuous Person*, may be justly ascrib'd to them; and yet the *Laity* concur in the *Sentence* by their *Approbation* and *Suffrage*, as that learned *Doctor* owns they did in the *Primitive Church*. (Of which afterwards.)

But for the Passage from whence Mr. Dr—— wou'd prove, That the Apostle appropriated to himself, the passing the *Sentence* of *Excommunication* on the *Incestuous Corinthian*, it is not very probable, that it does refer to that *Sentence* at all. And therefore the fore-said learned Commentator observes, “ That those Words “ of *delivering up to Satan*, are to be understood of that “ Miraculous Power the Apostles had of *delivering Men “ to Satan, to inflict Corporal Distempers on 'em for the “ Punishment of the Flesh*. (The Word *δυναμεις*, or “ Power at v. 4. referring to some extraordinary mi- “ culous Power, and not to any simple Act of Disci- “ pline.) This *Power* (saith he) seems to be peculiar “ to the *Apostles*, and therefore, here St. Paul pre- “ scribes the doing of it, the *Authority* or *Power* of “ his Spirit being present with 'em. That this is indeed

“ the Import of *delivering up to Satan for the Destruction of the Flesh*, is evident not only from the concurring Exposition of the *Ancients* [such as *Theodoret, Chrysostome, Theophylact,*] who all interpret it of some *Disease* to be inflicted on him by Satan ; but also from the End of that *Delivery* to him, the *Destruction of the Flesh* ; and in the Case of *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, *That they might learn not to blaspheme*. Now *Bodily Afflictions* plainly tend to mortify the *Flesh*, and to awaken Men as oft as they come thus from a *miraculous Power*, to consider their Ways, and quit those Courses that thus subject ’em to the Hand of God. Whereas *Excommunication* hath no apparent Tendency to these Ends, when no such dreadful Issue follows from it ; and therefore seems not to be all that is intended by this *delivering up to Satan, &c.*” I take therefore the Matter to lie plainly thus, the Apostle requires this Church of *Corinth* to cast out this wicked Person from their Society according to the Power they had of judging those within. (This was to be done *authoritatively* by their Teachers, but with the Consent of the People.) And this the Apostle calls the Punishment inflicted on him by many ; and he here determines to enforce their Sentence on him, by using his *miraculous Power* in *delivering him up to Satan* to inflict some *Corporeal Disease* on him. But hearing of his Sorrow and Repentance, he urges them to forgive him, (by restoring him to their Communion,) and intimates, that he shou’d forgive him (by taking off the Penalty inflicted by the Use of his extraordinary Power.)

And the same Answer may serve as to *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, the *delivering ’em to Satan* importing the Exercise of a *miraculous Power* ; ’tis no wonder we read of none joining with the Apostle in it.

Mr. Dr — adds, “ That as the *Apostles* did without all doubt exercise this Power themselves, so likewise, it was appropriated to such Persons as we call *Bishops* in after Ages. This is the Reason of

“ that

“ tha  
 “ pri  
 “ Age  
 “ liev  
 “ stan  
 “ pass  
 “ An  
 and y  
 does l  
 ing it.

I.  
 Power  
 Life,  
 the Cl  
 Thing  
 fles p  
 the O  
 we sho  
 in the  
 tion m  
 shops w  
 were l  
 rity o  
 dalous  
 comm  
 witho  
 severa  
 Apostl  
 in any  
 with

2.  
 priate  
 call B  
 I chal  
 cesan

3.  
 gun to  
 some

“ that Super-eminent Power, which *Ignatius, St. Cyprian*, and all the *Canons* and *Councils* of the first Ages of Christianity ascribe to *Bishops*. And I believe *Mr. B*—— will not be able to produce one Instance, wherein the Sentence of *Excommunication* was pass’d on any Delinquent without a *Bishop*.

*Answ.* This Paragraph is made up of several *Mistakes*, and yet were the main of what is alledg’d in it true, does but destroy *Mr. Dr*——’s Cause instead of supporting it.

Tis made up of several *Mistakes*.

1. ’Tis not true, That the *Apostles* appropriated the Power of *Excommunication* to themselves during their Life, the contrary appears from the Charge given to the Church of *Corinth*; and indeed the Reason of the Thing confutes any such vain Pretence. For the *Apostles* planted many Churches whom they never had the Opportunity to visit again afterwards; And unless we shou’d suppose there were no scandalous Delinquents in their Communion, either the Power of *Excommunication* must be lodg’d in the Hands of those *Presbyter-Bishops* which the *Apostles* fix’d among ’em; or else, they were left without any Remedy for preserving the Purity of those Churches by the Exclusion of their scandalous Members. Unless we suppose the *Apostles* excommunicated such Offenders by meer *implicite Faith*, without any particular Trial or Examination of their several Causes. Nay ’tis doubtful to me, whether the *Apostles* ever excommunicated any Person at all, at least in any Church which they had settled, and furnished with *Presbyter-Bishops* to govern ’em.

2. ’Tis utterly untrue, That the *Apostles* ever appropriated the Power of *Excommunication* to such as we now call *Bishops*, if *Mr. Dr*—— mean *Diocesan ones*. For I challenge him to produce one Instance of such a *Diocesan Bishop* for the Two First Centuries.

3. ’Tis as untrue, That after the *Parochial-Bishop* begun to be distinguish’d from his *Assistant-Presbyters* by some Superiority over ’em, that the Power of *Excommu-*



nication was appropriated to the *Parochial-Bishop*. There is no such Thing suggested in the *Epistles* of *Ignatius*. *St. Cyprian* is so far from appropriating this Power to himself, that he frequently declares, that he wou'd do nothing in the Case of *Censuring* scandalous *Delinquents*, without the concurrent Judgment of his *Presbyters*, and without the Consent of his People. (As he may see in the Passages before-cited.) Nay his *Parochial Presbyters* did *censure* scandalous *Delinquents* in his *Absence*.

Nay to go lower, *St. Jerome* himself asserts the Power of *Excommunication* to belong to the *Presbyters* Office, in the Place fore-cited, *licet Presbytero si peccavero Satana me tradere in interitum carnis, &c.* The *Presbyter* may if I offend deliver me to Satan, &c. I grant that *Jerome* does there understand that Phrase concerning *Excommunication*, tho' other as ancient Writers (as I have shewn) more truly understood it of the Exercise of a miraculous Power: But 'tis evident that he suppos'd the Power of *Excommunication* a Branch of the *Presbyters* Office. *Theodoret* not only declares that † *αρχιεπισκοπία*, i. e. the Power of Ruling the Church belongs to *Presbyters*; but gives this Reason, why the *Apostle* wou'd not have an Accusation admitted against an Elder under two or three Witnesses, because he having [*ἐκκλησιαστικῆς αρχιεπισκοπίας*] the Government of the Church, and in the Exercise of it often grieving *Delinquents*, they being ill-affected to him, will be apt to bring false Accusations. *Chrysostome* \* while a *Presbyter* threatens some of his

† See *Theodoret* in 1. *Timoth.* V. 19.

\* *Καὶ ὁππότε ἰδῶ, ἀπαρξέυσω λοιπὸν ὑμῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τέτων ἐπιβῆναι πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μεταχειρῶν μυστηρίων.* *Chrysost.* Hom. 17. in Mat. Op. Tom. 2. p. 125. That these Homilies upon *Matthew* were deliver'd when he was a *Presbyter* at *Antioch*; See the Notes in Tom. 8. p. 145. *Savil* indeed adds, *Loqui videtur ut Episcopus*; but allows it most probable they were written by him at *Antioch*.

*Auditors* that he wou'd *excommunicate* 'em. And in the Sixth Age, \**Justinian* forbids *Bishops* and *Presbyters* to exclude any from *Communion*, till such Cause was declar'd for which the *Canons* appointed it to be done; and will have the *Sentence* of *Excommunication* pass'd by *Bishops* or *Presbyters* without Cause to be rescinded. And as the *Presbyters* join'd in *Excommunication*, so they did in the *Absolution* of *Penitents*. Their *Hands* were laid on with those of the *Parochial Bishop* on the *Head* of the *Person* absolv'd.

But I add,

That the main of what Mr. Dr—— alledges, is so far from serving the *Diocesan Cause* that it overturns it.

Mr. Dr—— faith, " That Mr. B. will hardly produce one Instance of the *Sentence* of *Excommunication* being pass'd without a *Bishop*.

*Answ.* If he mean a *Diocesan Bishop*, 'tis utterly untrue; I must desire him to produce us one Instance of such a *Diocesan Bishop* in the Two First Centuries; and much more one Instance of such a *Bishop* engrossing this Power of *Excommunication* over all the Churches in a large *Province* or *County*. If he mean a *Parochial Bishop* as distinguish'd from his *Assistant-Presbyters* or *Curates*, I am under no Obligation in the Defence of my Cause to produce him any such Instance; tho' I have already produc'd him an Instance of St Cyprian's *Presbyters*, censuring *Delinquents* in his *Absence*. But I must on the other Hand, desire Mr. Dr—— to produce me any Instance in the Three First Centuries, wherein even a *Parochial Bishop* pass'd this *Sentence*, without the *Concurrence* of his *Presbyters* therein. And if he cou'd no more *Excommunicate* without his *Presbyters*, than they

---

\* Omnibus Episcopis & Presbyteris interdiciamus segregare aliquem a sacra communione, antequam causa monstretur propter quam sanctae regulae hoc fieri jubent. Si quis autem praeter hoc a sancta communione quenquam segregaverit; ille quidem qui injuste segregatus est, solutus excommunicatione a majore sacerdote, sanctam mereatur communionem.

*Novel. 123. cap. 11.*

without him, this plainly shews, That the Power was common to both, only the Bishop had as the *Præses* or Moderator of the Parochial Presbytery, the chief Hand therein. But he was so far from having a sole Power of Excommunication, that his Sentence without the Concurrence of the Presbyters in it was null and void. Let us see then what Mr. Dr—— will make of his Argument. The Presbyters cou'd not excommunicate without the Bishop; therefore the Power of Excommunication was appropriated to the Bishop. And why may not I at this Rate argue, the Bishop cou'd not excommunicate without the Presbyters; therefore the Power of Excommunication was appropriated to the Presbyters. I might parallel it with another, The Bishops of the Province were requir'd by the Council of Nice, Can. 6. not to ordain without the Leave of the Metropolitan. Therefore, according to this way of Reasoning, the Power of Ordination was appropriated to the Metropolitan.

But if the Primitive Bishop was only a Parochial one, then the Argument turns upon Mr. Dr—— to the utter subversion of his Cause. In the Primitive Church, the Sentence of Excommunication was pass'd by the Parochial Bishop and his Assistants, (i.e. the Parish Rector and his Curates) therefore it cannot be appropriated to a Diocesan, without destroying the Rights of all the Parochial Bishops in his Diocess. And if the Power do of Divine Right belong to the Parochial Bishop, It cannot belong to a Diocesan one, his Authority being founded on the Ruin of their's.

The next Act that Mr. Dr. appropriates to a Diocesan Bishop, is that of Confirmation; and to prove, that it peculiarly belongs to such a one, Mr. Dr—— alledges Two Things:

1. That we read constantly in Scripture, "That the Apostles alone confirm'd baptiz'd Persons. For St. Philip who was an Evangelist and a Presbyter (as Mr. B. has observ'd from Grotius,) yet after he had baptiz'd the Men of Samaria, he cou'd not confirm 'em, but



“ But the Apostles were forc’d to send Peter and John  
 “ to lay their Hands upon ’em, VIII Acts 14.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. Mr. Dr—— shou’d first explain to us, what he means by *Confirmation*. For he either means by *Confirmation*, the laying on of Hands on baptiz’d Persons, to confer on ’em the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit, or the laying Hands on ’em to confer the ordinary sanctifying Operations of the Holy Spirit. Or he means, The Admission of adult Persons that had been baptiz’d in their Infancy to the Communion of adult Members, upon a personal Recognition of their Baptismal Vow.

If he mean by it the *First* of these, this no doubt was peculiar to the *Apostles*; but this is never call’d in Scripture *Confirmation*. And it were absurd for any *Bishops* whatever, whether *Parochial* or *Diocesan*, to pretend to imitate the *Apostles* in this, when they have no such Power of *Conferring* the *Holy Ghost* in its extraordinary Gifts; and therefore Mr. Dr——’s Argument from VIII Acts 14. is miserably weak and inconclusive. For ’tis manifest, that Passage refers entirely to the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost (such as the Gift of Tongues, of Miracles, of Prophecy, &c.) for unless we suppose all whom Philip baptiz’d, to have been such Hypocrites in their Profession as Simon Magus was, some of ’em must have already receiv’d the Holy Ghost in its renewing and sanctifying Operations. For all the living Members of Christ are Partakers thereof, and if any Man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his, VIII Rom. 9. But we read, That the Holy Ghost was yet fallen upon none of ’em. And therefore it was upon the Imposition of the Apostles Hands, that they receiv’d the Holy Ghost in these extraordinary Gifts. And it was to purchase the Power of bestowing these extraordinary Gifts, that Simon Magus offer’d Money to the Apostles, being sensible that these miraculous Gifts and Operations of the Holy Spirit, were as preferable to his delusive Sorceries, as the most precious Jewels are to false and counterfeit Stones. Whereas the sanctifying Operations of the Holy Spirit are inward and indiscernible,  
 and

and such 'as that vile *Sorcerer* wou'd have offer'd nothing for the *Purchase* of.

Mr. Dr—— may thus easily see what his Argument will amount to, *Philip* the *Evangelist* cou'd not bestow the *extraordinary Gifts* of the Holy Ghost, but only the *Apostles*; therefore *Bishops* now only have the Power of bestowing these *Gifts*. And for this *Conclusion* we shall believe it, when we see it *exercis'd*.

For the *laying on of Hands* to confer the ordinary *sanctifying Operations* of the Holy Spirit, I find no such Thing practis'd by the *Apostles* themselves (as *Monsieur Dalle* has at large demonstrated against the *Papists* in his *Treatise of the Sacrament of Confirmation*) nor do I find any *Promise* in all the *New Testament* of those *sanctifying Operations* to be annex'd to the *Use* of that *Rite*. And much less that a *Diocesan Bishop's Hands* have the *sole Vertue* of conveying 'em. And if Mr. Dr—— pretend to any such Thing, let him produce us some *Proof* of it, and it shall be consider'd.

For the *Admission* of *Persons baptiz'd in their Infancy*, when grown up to the *Communion* of adult *Members*, upon a publick *Recognition* of their *Baptismal Vow*, this I own is a *Practice* very conformable to the general *Rules* of the Holy *Scripture*: But this properly belongs to those *Pastors* who receive 'em into the *Communion* of the Church. And as I do not find that the *Apostles* ever practis'd this *Confirmation* themselves, so I find no *Shadow* of *Proof*, that they appropriated the *Power* of doing it to any *Diocesan Bishop*, for all the Churches in a *Province* or *County*. The *Pastors* of particular Churches are capable of judging concerning such adult *Persons*, whether they have a competent *Knowledge* of the *Principles* of Religion, and whether their *Conversation* be suitable to their *Profession*, and free from such scandalous *Crimes* as wou'd blast the *Credibility* of it. And if a *Diocesan Bishop* confirm 'em, it must be by a meer *implicite Faith* in the *Judgment* and *Integrity* of the *Parochial Pastors*, and not upon any *personal Enquiry* and *Examination* of his own. Let any unprejudic'd Man

then

then judge on whom the Work shou'd in all Reason be devolv'd? Upon the *Parish Pastor* that proceeds upon *personal Enquiry* and *Evidence* concerning the Person's fitness to be receiv'd to the Communion of adult Members? Or on the *Diocesan Bishop*, who must act only by *implicite Faith* in the *Parochial Pastor's* Word, having neither Leisure nor Capacity to do it on any *personal Enquiry*?

2. Mr. Dr—— next appeals to *Antiquity*, but by what I have already fully prov'd, *Antiquity* is entirely against him. For the *Confirmation* in Use among the Primitive Christians of the Three First Centuries, was perform'd by the *Parochial Bishop*, who (as I observ'd before) was capable of judging of the Person's fitness for the Communion of an adult Member; not by a *Diocesan*, who must needs be an utter Stranger to the far greatest Part of those whom he *confirms*, and must wholly rely upon the Testimony and Knowledge of another, whether the Person be fit to be *confirm'd*, or no. And if the Judgment of *Primitive Antiquity* must be follow'd; to appropriate this Power to a *Diocesan*, is to rob some Scores or Hundreds of *Primitive Bishops* of what was then accounted their Right. But this *Confirmation* which consisted in the laying on of Hands on the Person baptiz'd, was by the Ancients always practis'd immediately after *Baptism*. The Person baptiz'd being after Baptism *anointed* and *sign'd*, and Hands laid on him: Now tis manifest that *Presbyters* in the Primitive Church did frequently baptize; and therefore must perform this *Rite of Imposition of Hands*, which was then judg'd a necessary *Appendix* to *Baptism*. But to speak the Truth, it was one of the early Errors and Weaknesses of the *Primitive Christians*, to take this *Imposition of Hands* on the Person baptiz'd, in order to the conferring on him the *sanctifying Operations* of the Holy Spirit, for a *Rite of Divine Appointment*, and a *Sacrament* of equal *Necessary* with *Baptism* it self. They observ'd, that the *Apostles* laid their Hands on such as were baptiz'd, and that thereupon the Holy Ghost is said



said to fall on 'em. And not considering that this Rite was us'd only in conferring his extraordinary Gifts, they us'd it as a Means for conveying his ordinary sanctifying Influences. But this Mistake is so fully confuted by the formention'd Monsieur Daille, in his Treatise concerning the Sacrament of Confirmation, (as the Romish Church calls it) that I shall refer the Reader thither, who wou'd be fully satisfied how vain the Pretensions to a Divine Right for it are. And indeed the Error of the Ancients in Reference to this Rite of Confirmation, carried a tacit Reflection on the Virtue and Efficacy of Baptism it self. For they reckon'd that Baptism only prepar'd the Person baptiz'd for receiving the Holy Ghost, but that the Holy Spirit was actually convey'd by this additional Rite of Imposition of Hands; which is quite contrary to the Strain of the Holy Scripture, that makes Baptism the Sign of our New-Birth, and speaks of it as the Laver of Regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and asserts all true Christians to be baptiz'd into one Spirit. But that being no Part of the present Controversy, I shall not enlarge on it.

I now come to the

Third Act which Mr. Dr — appropriates to the Bishop's Office, viz. that of Ordination; and here Mr. Dr — renews his Challenge to Mr. B. to shew him, where a meer Presbyter ever so much as laid claim to it, either in the Apostles Days, or some Hundreds of Years after it?

But before Mr. Dr — enters on his Proof of this Point, he is pleas'd to quarrel with Mr. B's Notion of Ordination.

Mr. B. had said in Answer to that Objection against Timothy's being ordain'd by Presbyters [that Timothy being a superior Officer (i. e. an Evangelist) cou'd not be ordain'd by Presbyters, who are supposed to be an Office inferior to his;] That 'tis built on a Mistake, as if the Ordainers gave the Power to the Person whom they ordain, whereas the Power is deriv'd from Christ, and

flows  
descri  
mitted  
give  
Mayor  
the L  
when  
[now t  
to Dea  
the Or  
rity wh  
ordain  
senting  
those l  
as his  
This  
and Se  
" this  
" giv  
" unde  
" Apo  
" whe  
" post  
" the M  
" I sup  
" Min  
" Orda  
" is lo  
" ing  
" upon  
" they  
" whic  
" an E  
" Ans  
" diction  
" Ordina  
" with n  
" will ap

flows

flows from his *Charter* that constitutes the *Office*, and describes the *Qualifications* of those that shall be admitted to discharge it. And the *Ordainers* no more give that *Power*, than the *Recorder* gives the *Lord-Mayor* his *Power* when he invests him in his *Office*, or the *Lord-Chancellor* gives any *Officer of State* his *Power*, when he sets his *Seal* to his *Patent* (to use *Mr. King's* [now the *Archbishop of Dublin's*] *Comparison*, *Answer to Dean Manby*, p. 19, &c). This plainly shews, That the *Ordainers* only for *Order sake*, recognize the *Authority* which the *Charter* of *Christ* conveys to the *Person* ordain'd, upon his being qualify'd for the *Office*, consenting to undertake it, and being (by the *Election* of those he is to minister to, if he take a particular *Flock* as his *Charge*) call'd to it.

This *Notion* *Mr. Dr——* charges with *Inconsistency* and *Self-contradiction*. And thus reasons against it; “ If this be all, and if the other (*i. e.* of the *Ordainers* giving the *Power*) be a *Mistake*, I confess I do not understand, how our *Blessed Saviour* cou'd say to his *Apostles*, as my *Father* sent me, so I send you. From whence 'tis evident to me, that *Christ* gave the *Apostles* the same *Power* to ordain and commission others for the *Ministry*, as he had receiv'd from his *Father*; and I suppose *Mr. B.* will own that *Christ* had more than a *Ministerial Power* over his *Church*, &c. I confess the *Ordainers* do not give the *Original Power*, for that is lodg'd in, and flows from *Christ*. But then according to *Christ's* *Command*, they give 'em *Power*, *i. e.* upon *Trial* and *Examination* of their *Qualifications*, they authorize 'em to go and preach the *Gospel*, which they cannot do without such a *Commission*, or an *Extraordinary Call*.

*Answ.* The *Charge* of *Inconsistency* and *Self-contradiction* that *Mr. Dr——* advances against the *Notion* of *Ordination* which *Mr. B.* had laid down, may I think with much greater *Justice* be retorted upon himself. As will appear by examining his *Objections* against it.

As

As to this *First Objection*, he had been already told, That those Words [*As my Father sent me, so send I you*] have no direct Reference to the Power of Ordination at all. They only imply, that as *Christ* receiv'd his *Commission* immediately from the *Father*, so he did immediately send them to disciple all Nations, and to teach *em* whatever he had commanded. But this by no Means implies, that whatever Power *Christ* had himself, he invested the *Apostles* with, or gave them the same *Authority* and *Dominion* in his Church that belong'd to himself. His Power was *Despotal*, their's only *Ministerial*. And he himself warn'd *em* against aspiring any higher than a *Ministerial* Power, XX. Mat, 25. &c. He did not therefore make over his *Despotal Authority* of Commissioning others to them; but only a *Ministerial Authority* of investing such in the Office as his *Charter* shou'd authorize and oblige thereto. Mr. Dr—— himself confesses, that the *Ordainers* do not give the *Original Power*, but yet faith, they authorize those they ordain to go and preach the Gospel. What he means by the *Original Power* which is lodg'd in *Christ*, and flows from him, I do not well understand. The *Ordained Person* is doubtless authoriz'd and oblig'd to all the Parts of his *Ministerial Function*. I wou'd gladly then know from whom he derives that *Authority*, and by whom that *Obligation* is laid upon him; if he derive that *Authority* and *Obligation* from the *Charter* of *Christ*, (as the *Mayor* of a *Town-Corporate* derives his *Authority* from the *Royal Charter*,) then the *Ordainers* have no more to do than to judge of his *Qualifications*; and upon his Consent, to give him a solemn *Admission* to the exercise of the Office by *Fasting* and *Prayer*, and *Imposition of Hands*, (as the *Recorder* invests the *Mayor*.) If he derive his *Authority* and *Obligation* from the *Ordainers*, he is then properly their *Minister*, acts by a *Commission* deriv'd from them; so that 'tis the *Bishop's Letters* of Ordination, not the *Charter* of *Christ* that give him his *Authority*. But does he really think, that any *Minister* of *Christ* can satisfy himself with deriving his *Autho-*

rity



rity, from no higher *Original* than that of his *Ordainers*?  
 If therefore Mr. Dr—— by the *Original Power*,  
 mean that *Power* which gives every *Minister* his *Autho-*  
*rity*, then if this be lodg'd in *Christ*, and flow from him,  
 Mr. Dr——'s Notion is wholly overturn'd, and 'tis  
*Christ* that gives the *Power*, the *Ordainers* being only  
 the *Instruments of Conveyance*. But if by the *Original*  
*Power* being lodg'd in *Christ*, Mr. Dr—— mean no  
 more than that *Christ* had once indeed the *Power* of  
*authorizing* and *obliging* Men to preach his Gospel: But  
 he has made it over to the *Apostles*, and they to *Bishops*;  
 then the foremention'd *Absurdity* follows, That the *Bi-*  
*shop's Letters of Ordination* are all the *Charter* and *Com-*  
*mission* by which a *Minister* acts, and that he is more  
 properly the *Bishop's Minister* than *Christ's*. He shou'd  
 therefore in all Reason preach the Gospel, and baptize  
 in the *Bishop's Name*, from whom he has his *Commission*.

But saith Mr. Dr——“ If the *Ordainers* only recog-  
 nize the *Authority*, which the *Charter of Christ* con-  
 vey to the Person ordain'd, this seems a full *Com-*  
 mission to preach without *Ordination*. And he sees no  
 Reason why the Person shou'd be hindred from put-  
 ting his *Authority* in Execution, because some will  
 be so refractory as not to recognize it.

Answ. Mr. Dr—— need here only to apply the ob-  
 vious Distinction in *foro Dei*, & in *foro Ecclesia*. He  
 that has all the *Qualifications* requisite by the *Charter*  
 for the *Ministerial* or *Pastoral Office*; he whose *Qualifica-*  
*tions* are approv'd by other *Pastors* who are the most  
 proper *Judges* of 'em, and (if he be ordain'd to a par-  
 ticular Flock) by the *People* whom he is to take the  
 Oversight of; he who voluntarily devotes himself to  
 this Special Service of *Christ*, is by him actually au-  
 thoriz'd and oblig'd to the Office. But he is by the  
 same *Charter* oblig'd not to enter on the actual Exercise  
 of it, without the Solemnity of *Publick Prayer* and *Fast-*  
*ing* to recommend his Labours to the Blessing of God,  
 and *Imposition of Hands* in Order to the publick *Recog-*  
*nition* of this *Authority* in the Face of the Church, where-  
 ever

ever this solemn Inauguration can be had; and till then, he is not a *Minister in foro Ecclesia*, nor to be receiv'd, and regarded and obey'd as such. 'Tis the like Case as in *Baptism*, he that was an *Infidel* but becomes a sincere *Convert* to the Christian Faith, is in the Estimate of Christ, a real *Member* of his Church, and has a *Right* to the *Priviledges* of it. And his *Baptism* does not give, but suppose that Right, and solemnizes his *Admission* into the Church. But the Church is not oblig'd to own him as a *Member* till he is baptiz'd; and he cannot regularly partake of its *external Priviledges*, till he has taken upon him this *external Badge* of his Profession. So to use my former Similitude, The *Mayor* upon his *Election* is by the *Charter*, authoriz'd and oblig'd to the Government of a *Town-Corporate*: But he is not for Order sake, to exercise his *Authority* without a *publick Installation* by such *Officers* as the *Charter* appoints; nor is the *Corporation* till then oblig'd to receive and obey him as such: And yet his *Authority* is deriv'd from the *Charter*, not from those that instal or invest him. So here the same *Charter* of Christ that authorizes and obliges such a Person to be one of his *Ministers*, does also oblige him for Order sake, to enter by this solemn *Rite* upon the actual Exercise of it, wherever he can have such *Ministerial Ordination* and *Investiture*, and till then the Church is not oblig'd to pay him the respect due to his *Character*: but still his *Authority* is deriv'd from the *Charter*, not from his *Ordainers*; and none but Christ himself can really authorize and oblige him to the Ministerial Office. And for any others to pretend to do it, is but to usurp his Sovereign Authority as the *Head* of his Church, and the *Fountain* of all *Power* exercis'd by all that *Minister* in it. 'Tis the like Presumption as a *Recorder* wou'd be guilty of, if he shou'd pretend the *Power* of the *Mayor* is deriv'd from him; Or that the *Lord Chancellor* wou'd be guilty of, if he shou'd pretend that all those derive their *Power* from him whose *Patent* he seals; so an *Elective Prince* derives his *Authority* from his *Election*: But

But if the *Constitution* oblige him to be crown'd in Order to the publick Exercise of it, it will not thence follow, that those who perform the *Ceremony* of his *Coronation*, give him the *Royal Authority*.

And that Mr. Dr—— may not think this Account of Ordination any peculiar Notion of Mr. B's, I shall present it to him in the Words of a judicious Writer of the Establish'd Church, which I have lately perus'd, and whose Sentiments he will find entirely conformable to what I have here laid down. Mr. Olliffe in his *Answer* to Mr. Calamy, undertaking to treat of the *Nature* of the *Ministerial Call* or *Ordination*, thus explains it; *Def. of Min. Conf.* 8<sup>o</sup>. Lond. 1702. *Postscript*, p. 128, 129.

“ The Call to the Ministry is from *Christ*, which he  
 “ gives by conferring an *Ability* for it, and *Inclination*  
 “ to it. *Ordination* is the *Investiture* into this Office  
 “ before Men, by a *Declaration* or *Publick approving* a  
 “ Man to be a *Minister*; or is a solemn *Allowance* of his  
 “ preceding *Call*, and is a *Rite* to give a Man the cur-  
 “ rent Repute and Valuation of a Minister, and an Au-  
 “ thority to exercise the Function with Freedom and  
 “ Acceptation in the Church of God. It is a *Confirma-*  
 “ *tion* of a Man's Call from *Christ* to the Ministry,  
 “ (which is his *Commission coram Deo*) by the solemn  
 “ God-speed or *Approbation* of such who are in Autho-  
 “ rity, to give him the Reputation and Power of a  
 “ Minister *coram Hominibus*, to it's due Intents in the  
 “ Church where he is sent. It is *Christ* that hath ap-  
 “ pointed such an Office to be, furnishes a Man with  
 “ *Endowments* for it, and gives him a *Will*, so that he  
 “ dedicates himself to the Work, XII. *Rom.* 6, 7, 8.  
 “ 1 *Cor.* XII. 4, 7. XX. *Acts* 28. And for the Trial  
 “ hereof, the Question is put, *Do you think that you*  
 “ *are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you*  
 “ *this Office and Ministration?* And do you think in your  
 “ Heart, that you are call'd according to the *Will* of our  
 “ Lord *Jesus Christ*, &c. And what then doth Man  
 “ do, but upon Trial finding this to be so, he *authori-*  
 “ *tatively approveth* and *declareth* him to be a *Minister*,



“ and to have *Christ's Commission* for the Work of the  
 “ Ministry by the Solemnity of *Ordination*, and so adds  
 “ to him an *Authority* of exercising his Function towards  
 “ Man which he had not before? This is necessary  
 “ for the preserving of Order among Men, and to pre-  
 “ vent the Intrusion of incompetent and unqualify'd  
 “ Persons into the Office, and to give an Esteem in re-  
 “ gard of Men, many of whom will not, and others  
 “ for certain Reasons cannot hold one for a true and le-  
 “ gal Minister otherwise. *Ordination* (saith Amesius)  
 “ *nihil aliud est quam sollemnis Declaratio, ut Coronatio Re-*  
 “ *gis & Inauguratio Magistratus.* De Consc. Lib. 4. c. 25.  
 “ *Est sollemnis quædam Introductio Ministri in ipsius fun-*  
 “ *ctionis liberam functionem.* Med. Theol. Lib. 1. c. 39.  
 “ An *Adjunct* consequent to his Call from Christ to make  
 “ it current among Men. *Est Personæ Introductio, quâ*  
 “ *publicis precibus præmissis Ecclesiæ commendatur, eique*  
 “ *vocatio impositis manibus confirmatur.* Wolleb. It de-  
 “ clareth him before Men, and giveth him Authority  
 “ for the Exercise of the Ministry among 'em, and  
 “ commits him to the Grace of God for the Discharge  
 “ thereof.” Thus far that learned Divine.

But saith Mr. Dr——“ If *Ordination* be no more  
 “ than a bare *Designation* of the Person to whom Christ's  
 “ Charter shall convey the Power and Authority, the  
 “ Approbation of his Qualifications, and the Investiture  
 “ of him or solemnizing his Admittance; I can see no  
 “ Reason, why the People who are to elect (according  
 “ to this Author's Notions) shou'd not always ordain  
 “ likewise? And why they may not as well design  
 “ him who Christ has thus qualify'd, and solemnize his  
 “ Admittance? This is such a Way of making a Clergy-  
 “ man, as I believe was never heard of in the Christian  
 “ World before.

*Ans.* Tho' we suppose *Ordination* to include no  
 more than is here mention'd, there is very good Reason,  
 why it shou'd in all ordinary Cases be perform'd only  
 by such as are already Pastors in the Christian Church;  
 partly because those who themselves faithfully discharge  
 that

that Office, are the best Judges of the *Qualifications* of those that are *Candidates* of it (even tho' the People be allow'd to Judge of the suitableness of their *Gifts* to their *Edification*.) Partly because they have a particular Concern in the *Person* ordain'd, to whom they must give the right *Hand of Fellowship*, and whom they must admit as a *Colleague* in managing the common Interest of the Churches under their Care : Partly, because they only are impower'd to *Officiate* in all such *Acts of Publick Worship* : And to add no more, because the *Scriptures* never mention this *External Solemnity*, as perform'd by any that were not themselves dignify'd with the *Ministerial Office* when they invest others in it.

All these *Reasons* are sufficient to exclude the People from performing this *Solemnity*, wherever there are Ministers or Pastors to be employ'd in it ; and yet all this is consistent with what is asserted, that the *Ordainers* do not give the *Power* or *Authority*, but *Christ* by his *Charter*. And whereas Mr. Dr — seems to insinuate, as if the *People's Power* of electing their own *Pastors* were some peculiar Notion of Mr. B's, he must either be a great Stranger to the ancient Writers, or he must own it to be the current Judgment and Practice of all *Antiquity* ; and the *Exclusion* of the People from this *Privilege*, to be a manifest *Deviation* from it. Of which he may see that learned *Treatise* of Mr. Clarkson's, *No Evidence of Diocesan Churches in Primitive Antiquity*.

I know not what other *Way* Mr. Dr — wou'd have a *Clergyman* made, than what I have describ'd, unless he suppose some *Clergymen's Hands* to have some peculiar *Vertue* of imprinting an *indelible Character* that the *Hands* of others have not ; or unless he set the *Ordainers* in the Place of *Christ*, and make them *Fountains* of *Ecclesiastical Power*, instead of being the meer *Instruments* or *Channels* of *Conveyance*. For Mr. B. himself, he was invested in the *Pastoral Office* by several *Congregational Bishops* (such as the *Primitive Church* accounted *Bishops*) and that upon the free *Election* of the *Church*

whom he took the Charge of; and if this be not *entring in at the Door*, he wou'd be glad to know what is.

Mr. Dr—— objects, That Mr. B. had said in a former printed *Discourse*, that *Ordination by Pastors is not of absolute Necessity to the Being of the Ministry*. There have been and may be such extraordinary Cases, wherein a Man may be a Minister without it. As in the Case of a Number of Christians cast upon the Shore of a Pagan Nation, or that of the present Pastors of a Nation turning *Hereticks*, and refusing to ordain any that will not join with 'em in their *Heresy*.

To this Mr. Dr—— replies, “ That as no Man can  
“ preach or meddle with sacred Offices, except he be  
“ call'd of God or sent, so no Man is to call or send  
“ as from God, but he that is authoriz'd by him for  
“ that Purpose. It is the highest Presumption to ap-  
“ point Embassadors for God Almighty without his  
“ Orders. And there is the same Reason for Men's  
“ acting in Christ's House as his Ministers without any  
“ Commission at all, as to pretend to derive a Com-  
“ mission from them that had none themselves.

*Answ.* Since 'tis from the Charter of Christ, (describ-  
ing the Ministerial or Pastoral Office, and the Qualifica-  
tions of all that exercise it) That all Ministers derive  
their Authority; and since the Interposal of Ministerial  
Investiture is only a positive Institution for Order-sake,  
chiefly to prevent the Intrusions of unqualify'd Persons.  
The Question is, whether the Charter of Christ does  
not sufficiently authorize such qualify'd Persons to dis-  
charge that Office, when the Necessities of Souls  
call for it, and when this positive Institution for Order-  
sake, cannot in the present Circumstances be observ'd.  
To say, it does not, is to prefer a positive before a Mo-  
ral Precept, and a Precept that relates only to Order to  
the great End of it the Salvation of Souls; which is  
quite contrary to our Saviour's Rule, That God will  
have Mercy rather than Sacrifice. And Mr. Dr—— here  
takes that for granted, which Mr. B. denies; viz. That  
Christ's Charter in such extraordinary Cases, does not suf-  
ficiently



ficiently *Commission* a *qualify'd* Man to *minister* in his *House* when call'd thereto, by such as absolutely need the Assistance of his Abilities. And since Mr. B. confines this to *Cases* of *absolute Necessity*, nothing can be more *weak* than to argue against it from *Cases* where there was no *absolute Necessity*, and where *Ministerial Ordination* might be had. And as to such *Cases* Mr. Dr— shou'd consider the *Arguments* Mr. B. had offer'd before he pretend to censure his *Assertion*.

Mr. Dr— at last proceeds, *Seç. IV. p. 57.* to prove, “ That the *Imposition of Hands* in *Ordination* “ was always *appropriated to one* of the *Clergy* superior “ to *Presbyters*, and whom we call *Bishop*, and that no “ *meer Presbyter* can with any Reason pretend to it.

This he pretends to prove;

1. *From Scripture*; and here he tells us of the *Apostles* “ ordaining the *Deacons*, *Acts* 6. 8. And neither the “ *People* nor the *Seventy* laid their Hands on 'em.” To this Purpose he cites *Acts* 19. 6.—Tho' the Place has no Reference to *Ordination* at all. And he concludes with the *Apostles Directions* to *Timothy* and *Titus*.

*Ans.* That the *Apostles* ordain'd *Deacons*, and ordain'd *Presbyters* in every Church, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were directed to ordain *Bishops* or *Elders* where there were none before, is freely granted. But what signifies this to prove, That an *Officer* superior to *Scriptural Bishops* or *Elders*, is for all succeeding Ages to be entrusted with the *sole Power of Ordination*; or what is the same, that a *Diocesan Bishop* is so? Of such a *Bishop*, the *Scriptures* are intirely silent, whereas they do mention the *laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*, and that upon *Timothy* himself. So that the *Scriptures* do expressly mention the *Ordination of Prebyters*, but no where of *Bishops* as superior to, and distinct from *Presbyters*. And for *meer Presbyters* as distinguish'd from, and inferior to *Bishops*, the *Scriptures* mention no such *Officers*; and therefore 'tis no wonder that they speak nothing of their *Authority to ordain*; Nor have the *Dis-*

*senters* whose *Ordinations* this Gentleman arraigns any such meer *Presbyters* at all.

2. Mr. Dr—— argues from *Antiquity*; and here he tells us, “ That sacred Action was so inherent in the Person of the *Bishop*, that it was look’d on as *Sacrilege* and *Madness* for any of an inferior Order, for any meer *Presbyter* to pretend to it.

Because Mr. Dr——’s Plea is here the most plausible and popular of any he has yet offer’d, I shall in Order to convince him of the utter *Invalidity* of it to serve his Cause,

*First* shew, That were it true, that the *Ancients* had appropriated the Power of *Ordination* to their *Bishops* as distinguish’d from *Presbyters*, it wou’d no way be prejudicial to the Cause I plead, but is utterly destructive of his.

*Secondly*, I shall shew, That the *Ancients* did neither wholly exclude their *Presbyters* from the Power of *Ordination*, nor did think what Confinement they laid on the Exercise of it a Matter of *Divine Right*.

*First*, Were it true, That the *Ancients* had appropriated the Power of *Ordination* to their *Bishops* as distinguish’d from *Presbyters*, it wou’d be no Way prejudicial to the Cause I plead, but is utterly destructive of his.

For if the *Primitive Bishop* for the Two First Centuries, (nay generally thro’ the Third) was no more than a *Congregational Pastor* or *Parish Rector*, and the *Presbyters* his *Assistant Curates* (as I have fully shewn :) Then ’tis manifest, that all those Reformed Churches *Abroad*, and those Dissenting Churches at *Home*, that are not under *Diocesan Bishops*, are yet under the Government of *Congregational* or *Parochial Bishops*, and all their *Ordinations* are perform’d by as great a Number of neighbouring *Parochial Bishops* as the ancient *Canons* did require. So that all those *Ordinations* which this Gentleman has the Confidence to declare *null* and *void*, are in the Sense and Language of the *Primitive Church Episcopal Ordinations*, and perform’d by proper *Bishops*.

*Bishops*.  
*Presby*  
 numer  
 jutor or  
 these  
 the *Ha*  
 occur i  
 emplo  
 Polycar  
 On  
 Altar  
 Power  
 gation  
 all the  
 Provin  
 Hands  
 of the  
 of the  
 what  
 from  
 tain’d  
 Infect  
 Fifth  
 monst  
 Chur  
 rum,  
 Figur  
 Enlar  
 ceiv’  
 with  
 and  
 of a  
 men  
 of th  
 tion  
 exce  
 pacy  
 Ant  
 chia

*Bishops.* 'Tis true indeed we have not the Primitive *Presbyters* or *Curates*. For where the Congregation is numerous, the *Pastor* or *Bishop* usually takes in a *Coadjutor* or *Colleague*, as *Valerius* took in *St. Austin*. And for these *Subject-Presbyters*, we find nothing of 'em in the *Holy Scriptures* and the *First Century*, tho' they do occur in the *Second*; and therefore we use 'em not, but employ only such *Presbyters* as are as truly *Bishops* as ever *Polycarp*, or *Ignatius* or *Irenæus* was.

On the other Hand, If every Church that had its *Altar* or *Communion-Table* had its *Bishop* too, and if the *Power of Ordination* was then lodg'd in such *Congregational Bishops*: Then 'tis manifest, That the depriving all the *Congregational* or *Parochial Bishops* thro' a large Province of this Power, and the engrossing it into the Hands of the *Diocesan Bishops*, must in the Judgment of the Ancients be regarded as an *Invasion* on the *Rights* of the *Primitive Bishops*, who are hereby degraded into what Mr. Dr—— calls *meer Presbyters*, and excluded from a Power which they enjoy'd, while the Church retain'd its primitive Simplicity, and kept free from the Infection of that Ambition that begun in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, and in the succeeding ones came to so monstrous an Height both in the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches. So just is that Remark of the *Bishop of Sarum*, That the enlarging of *Dioceses* had alter'd the whole Figure of *Primitive Episcopacy*; and the Truth is, this Enlargement being gradually made, was the less perceiv'd. The *Bishops Charge* in greater Cities, was long within the common Bounds of an *overgrown Parish*, and did but by several insensible Steps swell to the Bulk of a *modern Diocess*. And even this gradual Enlargement did not escape the Notice and Complaint of some of the best Men in those very Ages wherein this Ambition first appear'd, as the Reader may see in those two excellent Treatises, Mr. Clarkson's *Treatise of Episcopacy*; and *No Evidence of Diocesan Churches in Primitive Antiquity*. Upon the Whole, since the *Rights* of *Parochial* and *Diocesan Bishops*, are in this Point of *Ordination*



tion inconsistent and incompatible; if *Antiquity* suppos'd the former vested with the Power of Ordination, they cou'd not suppose it by *Divine Right* appropriated to the latter. So that Mr. Dr——'s Cause stands condemn'd if the Judgment of *Antiquity* be allow'd.

But

Secondly, I shall shew, That the *Ancients* did not wholly exclude the *Presbyters* from the Power of Ordaining, nor did look on the Confinement they laid on the Exercise of it as a Matter of *Divine Right*.

The *Ancients* did not wholly exclude their *Curate-Presbyters* from the Power of Ordaining.

Mr. Dr——himself has furnish'd me with a convincing Proof of it, which I shall mention and vindicate from the Attempt he has made to elude the Force of it. 'Tis the *Third Canon* of the Council of Carthage which requires, That when a *Presbyter* is ordain'd, the *Bishop* Blessing him and holding his Hands on the Party's Head, all the *Presbyters* that are present shou'd hold their Hands near the *Bishops* Hand on his Head. By which we see, it was the general Practice that the *Presbyters* (i. e. the *Parochial Curates*) shou'd join with the *Bishop* (or *Parish Rector*) in the Ordination of a *Presbyter* (or *Assistant-Curate*.) And 'tis in Imitation of this general Practice of the ancient Church, that in the *Establish'd Church*, such as are now call'd *Presbyters*, (viz. the *Parish Rectors*, who were the ancient *Bishops*) now join with the *Diocesan* in the Imposition of Hands on the Person ordain'd.

But as to this Mr. Dr——tells us, " That all the *Presbyters* had to do, was only to give their Consent, and to let the Church know that so sacred an Action, was not done rashly nor out of Favour and Affection. That they had no *Divine Right* to concur with the *Bishop*, that the Power of Ordination was in the *Bishop* alone, the *Presbyters* were only allow'd to perform a Share in the outward Ceremony, &c.

Answ.

*Ans.* This is indeed magisterially asserted, but nothing that I see brought for the Proof of it, but a slender Argument that *Blondell* has fully answer'd ready, though our Author takes no Notice of it; the Argument is, That if there was any Irregularity in the Ordination, the Bishop alone (not the Presbyters) was call'd to an Account, and punish'd for it by the Canons of the Church, which wou'd not have been the case, if all were concern'd alike in the Ordination. As this *Blondell* has shewn, That neither is the Matter of Fact here suppos'd clear and certain, that the Bishop alone was accountable for the Irregularity of such Ordinations: Nor is the Consequence valid, if the Matter of Fact were true. For since the Bishop or Parish Rector was the chief Hand in ordaining such Assistant Curates, it was no way unreasonable to make him (rather than those Assistant Curates that join'd with him therein) accountable for any such Irregularity, in those Provincial Synods made up of the Parochial Bishops and Presbyters of the Province where such Matters were examin'd. The Bishop that presid'd in that sacred Action, was chiefly concern'd to see that the Canons agreed on in their Provincial Synods, were observ'd duly in the Management of the Ordination. But that the Ancients did not suppose the Presbyters concern'd as meer Consenters to what the Bishop did, and desirous to let the Church know, that the Bishop did not act rashly, nor out of Favour and Affection; but from his own Judgment, that all that were dignify'd with the Evangelical Priesthood had such an inherent Power of Ordination, whatever Restraints Ecclesiastical Canons might lay on the Exercise of it, is I think evident from that Passage in *Firmilian* (who may justly be suppos'd to understand the Judgment of the African Churches) wherein he tells us, all Power and Grace is plac'd or constituted in the Church where Seniors (*maiores natu*) preside, who possess the Power both of baptizing and laying on Hands and ordaining. And who these Seniores (or *maiores natu*) are, may be justly expounded by that parallel Passage in *Tertullian*, where speaking of those Church-

*Church-Assemblies* in which their *Ecclesiastical Discipline* was exercised, he saith, *President probati quique seniores bonorem istum non pretio sed merito adepti*, those approved Elders preside who had obtain'd that Honour by Merit not by Price. And that the Presbyters as well as Bishops are included in his *Majores natu* is hence evident that they were among the *Seniores* and *Præpositi*, that were the Members of those yearly Provincial Councils mention'd in that *Ep. Sect. 3.* [See for Proof here *Irenic. p. 354, 355.* and *Blondell's Apol. p. 200, &c.*] And I have already shewn him from Cyprian, that he accounted his Presbyters to be as truly concern'd as himself in all Clerical Ordinations, and therefore Apologiz'd for himself, even for ordaining a Reader without their concurrence, and that in a Case of Necessity. And indeed if their Presbyters had no Divine Right to concur in Ordinations, or had no Power of Ordaining, there was no manner of Reason for their laying on of Hands with the Bishop therein. The People's Consent to the Person's being ordain'd, was as requisite as the Presbyters and yet they were no way allow'd either by themselves or by any as delegated by 'em to lay on Hands. The Presbyters were to declare publicly their Approbation of the Person to be ordain'd, so that they needed not to lay on Hands for any such End, as to shew the Church that the Bishop did not act rashly. So that this Gentleman makes their Imposition of Hands not only a bare Ceremony, but a very insignificant and useless one, nay, dangerous one too, since it carried all the outward Appearance of their exercising a Power which it seems they never had at all.

Mr. Dr—— tells us indeed, That there is a notable Instance in Antiquity of Presbyters ordaining Presbyters viz. of Coluthus ordaining Presbyters, and particularly Ischyas, and of these Ordinations being null'd by the Patriarchal Synod of Alexandria; and this with Bishop Billson he makes to be an Argument of the universal Consent of the Church, That a Presbyter cou'd not ordain a Presbyter.

Ans.



*Answ.* But why does not Mr. Dr—— who pretends to be so well vers'd in *Blondell*, take Notice of what has said to overthrow the Force of this Objection, what Dr. *Stillingsfleet* has given us, as the *Epitome of Blondell's Answer*. For *Iren.* p. 381. The learned Editor mentioning this Objection tell us, there is no great Difficulty in answering it, "For First, The pronouncing such an Ordination null, does not give Evidence that they look'd on the Power of Ordination, as belonging of Divine Right only to Bishops; for we find by many Instances, that acting in a bare Contempt of Ecclesiastical Canons, was enough to degrade any from being Presbyters. Secondly, If *Ischyra*s had been ordain'd by a Bishop, there were Circumstances enough to induce the Council, to pronounce it null. First, as done out of the Diocess in which Case Ordinations were null'd by Council *Arel.* c. 13. Secondly, Done by open and pronounced Schismatics. Thirdly, Done *sine Titulo* 'Αποκαλειόμενος, and so null'd by the Canons then. Thirdly, *Colluthus* did not act as a Presbyter in ordaining, but as a Bishop of the Meletian Party in Cynus, as the Clergy of *Mareotis* speaking, of *Ischyra*s's Ordination καὶ κολλῶν τὸ Πρεσβυτέρου πανλαδένῳ ἐπισκοπῇ, by *Colluthus* a Presbyter making shew of being a Bishop, and is suppos'd to have been ordain'd Bishop by *Meletius*. More concerning this may be seen in *Blondell*, who fully clears all the Particulars here mention'd; so that notwithstanding this Instance nothing appears, but that the Power of Ordination was restrain'd only by Ecclesiastical Laws.

To this I may add, That to make the Practice of a patriarchal *Alexandrian* Synod, an Argument of the Consent of the universal Church, is but an ill way of reasoning: When 'tis manifest, that as Ambition early prevail'd in such Synods (according to *Gregory Nazianzen's* just Observation concerning 'em) so the greatest Deviations from Primitive Simplicity and Purity usually begun there.

But

But if Mr. Dr—— had a Mind to see Instances of *Presbyters ordaining*, Why did he take no Notice of those mention'd by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, viz. *Paphnutius* the *Presbyter's* ordaining *Daniel Deacon* in the Desert of *Scetis*, as *Job. Cassianus* informs us, *Collat. 4. c. 1.* And that of *Pelagius Bishop of Rome*: There were only two *Bishops* concurr'd in his *Ordination*, and one *Presbyter*. Whereas according to the Fourth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, three *Bishops* are requir'd to the *Ordination* of a *Bishop*. Either then (as the Doctor well argues) *Pelagius* was no *Canonical Bishop*, and so the grand Point of *Succession* fails thereby in the Church of *Rome*; or else a *Presbyter* has the same intrinsical Power of *Ordination* with a *Bishop*, but it is only restrain'd by *Ecclesiastical Laws*. He may see other Instances in the same excellent Author. So he may in *Blondell* see an Instance of the *Gothick Churches*, that for near Seventy Years had no other Government and *Ordination*, but what was in the Hand of *Presbyters*. And *Hilary the Deacon* mentions it as a common Practice in *Aegypt*, for the *Presbyters* to ordain where there was no *Bishop*, or in his Absence. If Mr. Dr—— had given us any tolerable Answer to such Instances as these, which he may find in *Blondell*, *Apol. p. 157, 158, &c.* he might have had a better Pretence to make the Challenge he does on this Occasion. But as to the Cause I plead, 'tis little concern'd in this Dispute at all; for if *Parochial Bishops* have an undisputed Power of *Ordination*, 'tis sufficient to justify Our's, whether the *Curate-Presbyters* were or were not allow'd that Power by the *Ancients*; tho' I have already shewn him, even they were not excluded from it.

And for the Restraint lay'd upon the *Curate-Presbyters* themselves, I do not find that the *Ancients* did found it upon any higher Ground than *Ecclesiastical Customs* and *Canons*. I have already shewn, that *Jerome* meant no more by his *Quid facit Episcopus* &c. And when *St. Chrysostome* saith, *There is no great Difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter*, for they are also

admitted.

admitt  
only so  
thing  
Mr. D  
St. Je  
he has  
Excom  
the Bi  
nation.  
rior co  
the W  
gainst  
but or  
vested  
the E  
former  
wherea  
Baptis  
again  
much  
ers for  
Questi  
to the  
make  
there  
a Man  
constit  
Physici  
Mr. D  
as an  
Church  
Judgm  
his Su

\* F  
Novā  
γεννά  
δίου  
τοῦ  
ἀδελφ

admitted to teach and rule the Church, for the Bishops only seem to excel them in Ordination; he speaks nothing here of any Divine Right. And by the way Mr. Dr—— may see from these two Passages, that both St. Jerome and St. Chrysostome utterly overthrow what he has advanc'd in this Chapter, that the Powers of Excommunication and Confirmation are appropriated to the Bishop, for they only appropriate this Power of Ordination. As for St. Ambrose's Assertion, That the Inferior cou'd not ordain his Superior, I have already shewn the Weakness of it; and 'tis no Argument at all against a Presbyter ordaining a Presbyter, for that is but ordaining one to the same Office in which he is vested himself. And for Epiphanius's Argument against the Equality of Bishops and Presbyters, because \* the former beget Fathers to the Church in Ordination, whereas the latter beget only Sons by Regeneration in Baptism, and have not receiv'd Power to ordain; I must again tell Mr. Dr—— That this Argument is much of a Piece with those he produces to prove Prayers for the Dead; for Epiphanius here miserably begs the Question instead of any Attempts to prove it. For as to the Reason of the Thing, Why may not a Presbyter make a Presbyter, as well as a Man beget a Man? Does there need one of higher Rank of Creatures to produce a Man? Why then shou'd Presbyters be incapable of constituting a Presbyter? Why may not the Colledge of Physicians license one of their own Profession? But if Mr. Dr—— only insist on the Testimony of Epiphanius as an Argument what was the common Judgment of the Church in his Time, we may justly set St. Jerome's Judgment in Opposition to his, who was every way his Superior in Learning and Abilities. And 'tis certain

\* Ἡ μὲν [ἐπισκόπων] ὅτι πατέρων γενεὰ καὶ τάξις πατέρας γὰρ γενᾶ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. ἡ δὲ [πρεσβυτέρων] πατέρας μὴ δυναμένη γενᾶν, διὰ τῆς τῶ λαοῦ παλιγγενεσίας τέκνα γενᾶ. — καὶ πᾶς δὴον τε καὶ τὸν πρεσβύτερον καθιστᾶν, μὴ ἔχοντα χειροτονίαν καὶ χειροτονεῖν; Epiphan. adv. Hær. Lib. III. Vol. I. p. 908.



in Matter of Fact, that in earlier Ages than that of *Epiphanius*, *Presbyters* did concur with their *Bishop* in the Ordination of *Presbyters*, and so did as truly beget *Fathers* as *Children* to the Church. 'Tis true indeed, That *Presbyters* did not concur usually in the Ordination of *Parochial Bishops*, but neighbouring *Parochial Bishops*. But I have already shewn Mr. Dr ——— that all that can be made of that, is, That when one of the *Presbyters* of a *Parochial Church*, was advanc'd to such a Superiority over his *Brethren*, as the *Parish Rectors* have over their *Curates*; then the *Presbyters* or *Curates* were only allow'd to concur in the Ordination of their *Fellow-Curates* or of *Deacons* or *Readers*, but the *Rector* or *Bishop* was to be ordain'd by neighbouring *Parochial Rectors*. And as this it self had only its rise from *Ecclesiastical Custom*, not any *Divine Institution*, (no such *meer Curates* being to be found in *Scripture*) so it signifies nothing to the *Diocesan Cause*, according to which some *Scores* or *Hundreds* of *Parochial Bishops* are in a great Measure depriv'd of the Power of Ordination they anciently enjoy'd, tho' some *Remains* of their ancient *Right* still appear in some of the *Parish Rectors* still being allow'd to join with the *Diocesan* in Ordinations. But sure such a palpable Deviation from *Antiquity* it self, shou'd never pretend to any Thing like a *Divine Right* by those that insist on the *Testimonies* of the *Ancients* for the Proof of it.

Having thus rendred the *Testimony* of *Antiquity* unserviceable to the *Diocesan Cause* in this Point, I shall proceed to vindicate that Argument from the Holy *Scripture*, M. B. had alledg'd from *Timothy's* being vested in his Office, by the laying on of the Hands of the *Presbytery*. Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the *Presbytery*, 1 Tim. IV. 14.

To evade the Force of this Argument, Mr. Dr ——— had insisted on three Different Pleas.

1. That by *Presbytery* is not meant a *Company* of ordinary *Pastors*, but of *Apostles* or *Bishops*.

To

To this Mr. B. had answer'd, That the *Apostle* shou'd by *Presbytery* understand a *Company of other Apostles* joining with him, is an Exposition that carries no manner of Probability with it. The *Apostles in the Council of Jerusalem* are manifestly distinguish'd from the *Elders*. And tho' *Peter* and *John* stile themselves *Elders*, yet the Word *Presbytery* is never us'd in any such Sense in the Holy Scriptures (or indeed in any *ancient Writer*) as to signify the *College of Apostles*. Nor is it probable that if other *Apostles* had join'd with *St. Paul* in *Timothy's* Ordination, he wou'd have omitted the mention of 'em, when he speaks of the *laying on of his Hands*. Nay, 'tis much more probable, That the *Apostle* himself laid his Hands on *Timothy*, only for conferring some extraordinary Gift upon him (which as *Dr. Barrow* has observ'd, was the peculiar Power of an *Apostle*,) not in Order to the investing him into his ministerial Office, of which there is no Intimation there given. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. Whereas the *Presbytery* cou'd not confer such Gifts, and therefore their Imposition of Hands must be for vesting him in the Office.

Let us consider then what Mr. Dr—— replies to this.

He alledges, That *St. Chrysostome*, *Theophilus*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, understand by *Presbytery* a *Company of Bishops or Apostles*. And why may not I oppose to their Opinion that of *St. Jerome*, who from this very Passage infers, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were the same both in Name and Office in the *Apostle's* Time? Does Mr. Dr—— think those *Authors* he mentions more infallible in their *Expositions* than *St. Jerome*? If bare Authority then cannot determine this Question, we must come to the *Reasons* that may be alledg'd for countenancing the one or the other Exposition. And here Mr. Dr—— very gravely asks Mr. B. whether he thinks in his Conscience that he has said any Thing that has the least Colour or Shadow of Reason to invalidate the Opinion of those *holy Fathers*? And I must tell him, I think Mr. B. has offer'd very convincing Reasons for it, and must put it to his Conscience, whe-

ther he has said the least Syllable to invalidate 'em? He has offer'd to shew us no Place where the Word *Presbytery* is taken for a *Company of Apostles*. He has not taken the least Notice of the next Reason, That its utterly improbable, that the *Apostle* who elsewhere speaks in that humble Style of himself as *one born out of due Time, as the least of the Apostles, as one that was not meet to be call'd an Apostle because he persecuted the Church*, 1 Cor. XV. 8, 9. shou'd have the Vanity of ascribing *Timothy's Ordination* to himself (at 2 Tim. i. 6.) as if it were his sole *Act*, when other *Apostles* join'd with him in it; or shou'd speak of them (at 1 Tim. IV. 14.) under no other Denomination than that of a *Presbytery*, a Phrase no where us'd to signify the Colledge of *Apostles*. Besides the *History* of the *Apostle's Travels* renders this Exposition utterly improbable; because it was when *Paul* and *Barnabas* departed asunder one from the other, (Acts XV. 39.) that he first met *Timothy* at *Lystra*, and circumcised him, and upon the good Report he had from the Brethren, resolv'd to have him go forth with him as *Companion* in his *Labours* and *Travels*; and as it is most probable that he was then ordain'd, so there was then no other *Apostle*, and much less any Colledge or *Company of Apostles* to join with the *Apostle Paul* therein. The *Presbytery* then that laid their Hands on him was not a *Company of Apostles*, but of such *Presbyters* as the *Apostles* constituted in every *City* and *Church*. And whereas Mr. Dr—— tells us, it might be a *Company of Bishops*; if he mean *Diocesan Bishops*, we still renew the Demand of shewing us one Instance of such a *Diocesan Bishop* either in *Scripture* or in the *Two First Centuries*.

For the *Objection* against the *Presbyters* laying their Hands on *Timothy*, viz. That he was vested in an Office superior to theirs (i. e. that of an *Evangelist*). Mr. B. had shewn him, that the *Ordainers* do not give the Power, they are only *Instruments of Conveyance*; as the *Lord-Chancellor* does not give the Power to those whose *Patents* he seals; nor does the *Archbishop* give the

the King  
forms  
such Ca  
Office,  
a Super  
Bishops  
the Rom

Mr.  
offer'd  
I to wh  
here pr  
and Ec  
Governm  
ture and  
on a D  
gave th  
can rec  
themsel

Answ  
positive  
was gra  
where  
quite co  
Things  
ctrine)  
also, i  
those Di  
to other  
Instituti  
ar Order  
tis certa  
to Dioc  
ause th  
ies or r  
ransmit  
extinguish  
Beside  
Timoth  
and y



the King or Queen their *Royal Authority*, when he performs the *Ceremony* of their *Coronation*. Now as in such Cases, an *Inferior* may vest his *Superior* in a *civil Office*, so may an *Inferior* Officer in the Church invest a *Superior*. As Mr. Dr—— must own it to be so, when *Bishops* consecrate an *Archbishop*, and so must those of the *Romish Church* when the *Cardinals* create a *Pope*.

Mr. Dr—— refers us here to what he had already offer'd against this *Notion of Ordination*, and so shall I to what has been answer'd on that Head; only he here pretends a mighty Difference between the *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical Constitution*. The *Business of Civil Government* (he tells us) depends on the *Law of Nature and Nations*, but the *Ordination of Pastors* is founded on a *Divine and positive Institution*. And that Christ gave this Power ~~to~~ but the *Apostles*, and none can receive this Power but from those that have it themselves.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. That the *Power of Ordination* is a *Matter of positive Institution*, I freely grant; but that this Power was granted to the *Apostles alone*, Mr. Dr—— has nowhere prov'd. The *Apostle Paul* himself supposes the quite contrary, when he directs *Timothy* to commit the *Things he had heard of him* (i. e. the *Christian Doctrine*) to *faithful Men*, who shall be able to teach others also, 1 Tim. II. 2. Whoever is a *Publick Depositary* of those *Divine Truths* himself, has a *Right to commit 'em* to other *faithful Men*. And there is no *positive Divine Institution* that confines this Power to any one particular Order of *Teachers* excluding the rest from it. And 'tis certain, the *Apostles* cou'd not transmit this Power to *Diocesan Bishops*, much less appropriate it to 'em, because there were no such *Bishops* for Two Centuries or more after their *Decease*: So that unless it was transmitted to *Parochial Bishops*, it is utterly lost and extinguish'd, and the pretended *Line of Succession* gone.

Besides, How comes Mr. Dr—— to tell us, "That *Timothy* was vested in an *Office* superior to *Presbyters*, and yet tell us that *Presbytery* signifies the *Office* of a

ther he has said the least Syllable to invalidate 'em? He has offer'd to shew us no Place where the Word *Presbytery* is taken for a *Company of Apostles*. He has not taken the least Notice of the next Reason, That its utterly improbable, that the *Apostle* who elsewhere speaks in that humble Style of himself as *one born out of due Time, as the least of the Apostles, as one that was not meet to be call'd an Apostle because he persecuted the Church*, 1 Cor. XV. 8, 9. shou'd have the Vanity of ascribing *Timothy's Ordination* to himself (at 2 Tim. i. 6.) as if it were his sole *Act*, when other *Apostles* join'd with him in it; or shou'd speak of them (at 1 Tim. IV. 14.) under no other Denomination than that of a *Presbytery*, a Phrase no where us'd to signify the Colledge of *Apostles*. Besides the *History* of the *Apostle's Travels* renders this Exposition utterly improbable; because it was when *Paul* and *Barnabas* departed asunder one from the other, (Acts XV. 39.) that he first met *Timothy* at *Lystra*, and circumcised him, and upon the good Report he had from the Brethren, resolv'd to have him go forth with him as *Companion* in his *Labours* and *Travels*; and as it is most probable that he was then ordain'd, so there was then no other *Apostle*, and much less any Colledge or *Company of Apostles* to join with the *Apostle Paul* therein. The *Presbytery* then that laid their Hands on him was not a *Company of Apostles*, but of such *Presbyters* as the *Apostles* constituted in every *City* and *Church*. And whereas Mr. Dr—— tells us, it might be a *Company of Bishops*; if he mean *Diocesan Bishops*, we still renew the Demand of shewing us one Instance of such a *Diocesan Bishop* either in *Scripture* or in the *Two First Centuries*.

For the *Objection* against the *Presbyters* laying their Hands on *Timothy*, viz. That he was vested in an Office superior to theirs (i. e. that of an *Evangelist*). Mr. B. had shewn him, that the *Ordainers* do not give the Power, they are only *Instruments of Conveyance*; as the *Lord-Chancellor* does not give the Power to those whose *Patenis* he seals; nor does the *Archbishop* give the

the Kin  
forms t  
such Ca  
Office, I  
a Super  
Bishops  
the Rom

Mr. I  
offer'd  
I to wh  
here pr  
and Ec  
Governm  
ture and  
on a D  
gave th  
an rece  
themsel

Answe  
positive  
was gran  
where p  
quite co  
Things  
trine)  
also, i  
those Di  
to other  
instituti  
ar Order  
is certa  
to Dioc  
ause th  
ies or n  
ransmitt  
extingui  
Beside  
Timoth  
and ye

the King or Queen their *Royal Authority*, when he performs the *Ceremony* of their *Coronation*. Now as in such Cases, an *Inferior* may vest his *Superior* in a *civil Office*, so may an *Inferior Officer* in the Church invest a *Superior*. As Mr. Dr—— must own it to be so, when *Bishops* consecrate an *Archbishop*, and so must those of the *Romish Church* when the *Cardinals* create a *Pope*.

Mr. Dr—— refers us here to what he had already offer'd against this *Notion of Ordination*, and so shall I to what has been answer'd on that Head; only he here pretends a mighty Difference between the *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical Constitution*. The *Business of Civil Government* (he tells us) depends on the *Law of Nature and Nations*, but the *Ordination of Pastors* is founded on a *Divine and positive Institution*. And that Christ gave this Power to none but the *Apostles*, and none can receive this Power but from those that have it themselves.

*Ans.* That the Power of *Ordination* is a Matter of *positive Institution*, I freely grant; but that this Power was granted to the *Apostles alone*, Mr. Dr—— has nowhere prov'd. The *Apostle Paul* himself supposes the quite contrary, when he directs *Timothy* to commit the things he had heard of him (i. e. the *Christian Doctrine*) to *faithful Men*, who shall be able to teach others also, 1 Tim. II. 2. Whoever is a *Publick Depositary* of those *Divine Truths* himself, has a *Right to commit 'em* to other *faithful Men*. And there is no *positive Divine Institution* that confines this Power to any one particular Order of *Teachers* excluding the rest from it. And 'tis certain, the *Apostles* cou'd not transmit this Power to *Diocesan Bishops*, much less appropriate it to 'em, because there were no such *Bishops* for Two Centuries or more after their Decease: So that unless it was transmitted to *Parochial Bishops*, it is utterly lost and extinguish'd, and the pretended *Line of Succession* gone.

Besides, How comes Mr. Dr—— to tell us, "That *Timothy* was vested in an *Office* superior to *Presbyters*, and yet tell us that *Presbytery* signifies the *Office* of a



"*Presbyter*." If he was only ordain'd a *Presbyter*, then the *Objection's* gone; for *Presbyters* may convey to others the *Power* they have receiv'd themselves.

But the *Truth* is, the *Objection* is founded on his Mistake of the *Ordainer's* properly giving the *Power*: Whereas it will vanish if we consider the true Reason of any Man's being concern'd in the *Ordination* of others, viz. the more effectual Prevention of unqualify'd *Intruders*. Since then all that are themselves the faithful *Publick Depositaries* of the *Christian Faith*, are capable *Judges* of the *Qualifications* of those that undertake to preach it, they are thereby sufficiently *authoriz'd* to commit it to 'em. And 'tis not material, whether those they commit it to, be design'd to be the *Stated Teachers* of a particular *Church*, or *itinerant Teachers* that labour for the *Conversion* of the *Infidel World*, and planting and settling *Churches* among 'em. The *Teachers* as well as *Prophets* of the *Church of Antioch*, join'd in the separating *Paul and Barnabas* to a particular ministerial Service, by *Fasting and Prayer*, and *Imposition of Hands*, *Acts XIII. 1, 2, 3*. And therefore no *positive Institution* cou'd debar the *Presbyters* of the *Church* where *Timothy* was ordain'd, from laying their *Hands* on him, and committing the *Christian Doctrine* as a *Depositum* to him, even tho' he was to be not a *fixed*, but an *itinerant Teacher* of it. There needed no more to qualify him for the latter Office, than a more eminent Degree of the same *Qualifications* that wou'd have capacitated him to discharge the former, and those who were capable *Judges* in the one Case, were so in the other too.

I am glad to find, that *Mr. Dr——* owns the Authority that *Archbishops* have over *Bishops* to be altogether *Civil*, and owing only to *humane Institution*. He'll please to add, that the *Authority* of *Diocesan Bishops* over *Parochial Rectors* (the true *Primitive Bishops*) is also *Civil*, and owing to *humane Constitution*, there will be an End of the Dispute. I am sure those *Laws* of ours that assert their *Authority* to be deriv'd from our *Princes*, suppose it be as much *Civil* as that of the *Archbishops*.

And

And if  
must be  
iniquity  
been la  
great a  
Mr.  
meant  
And to  
Ambros  
Answ  
Presbye  
the Off  
the wh  
corded,  
exercisi  
the utt  
the Pon  
byter, a  
Author  
allow,  
Ordina  
tion'd c  
dination  
And if  
of his  
ceiv'd  
that b  
Wou'd  
cesan B  
to be  
was in  
higher  
As  
counter  
Primasi  
better  
to the  
ready f  
sage to

And if Mr. Dr—— pretend a *Divine Right* for it, he must bring us other Evidence both from *Scripture* and *Antiquity* than he has yet done: But I hope enough has been said to convince him, that a *Diocesan Bishop* is as great a Stranger to *Primitive Antiquity* as it is to the *Bible*.

Mr. Dr—— next insists on it, That by *Presbytery* is meant the Office or Dignity of a *Presbyter* or *Bishop*: And to that Purpose alledges the Opinion of St. *Jerome*, *Ambrose*, *Primasius*, *Haymo*, *Lyranus*.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. If by *Presbytery* be there meant the Office of a *Presbyter*, then *Timothy* was ordain'd by the *Apostle* to the Office of a *Presbyter*. And since in this very Epistle where his Ordination to the *Presbyter's* Office is recorded, *Timothy* himself is directed by the *Apostle* in exercising his ordaining Power, it will thence follow to the utter subversion of Mr. Dr——'s Scheme, that the Power of Ordination belongs to the Office of a *Presbyter*, and is an essential Branch of their *Ecclesiastical Authority*. And this Consequence Mr. Dr—— must allow, unless he can prove that *Timothy* had a Second Ordination to an higher Office than that here mention'd of a *Presbyter*, and by Vertue of that Second Ordination only, receiv'd his Power of ordaining others. And if so, How comes the *Apostle* to omit all mention of his Second Ordination, and the higher Office he receiv'd thereby? Why does he not urge him to stir up that higher Gift he must be then suppos'd to receive? Wou'd it not look strange in giving Counsel to a *Diocesan Bishop* concerning Ordination, to advise him only to be mindful of the Office of a *Presbyter* in which he was invested, without ever taking any Notice of the higher *Episcopal* Office to which he was advanc'd?

As to the *Fathers* whom Mr. Dr—— cites as countenancing this Exposition, viz. *Jerome*, *Ambrose*, *Primasius* and *Haymo*: I shall only add, If he has no better Grounds for ascribing this to the three Last than to the First, he greatly wrongs 'em. For I have already shewn him, That St. *Jerome* cites this very Passage to prove, that the Scriptural *Bishop* and *Presbyter*

were the same both in *Name* and *Office*, which he could not have done with any Reason, but that that *Power of Ordination* was here ascrib'd to *Presbyters*, which in his Age the *Bishop* by Ecclesiastical Custom, had in a great Measure engros'd. And whereas Mr. B. had alledg'd to him, that the Word *Πρεσβυτεριον* is never us'd in the Scripture to signify the Office of a *Presbyter*, and is always us'd by the earliest Writers to signify a *Bench of Elders*, he refers Mr. B. for the Disproof of the latter, to the Council of *Nice*, *Antioch*, and *Africa*, to *Eusebius* and *Socrates*, whereas Mr. B. has pointed him to the Use of that Word in the Writers that flourish'd long before 'em, such as *Ignatius*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Cornelius*, &c. of which he takes no manner of Notice. And whereas Mr. Dr ——— refers Mr. B. for this Use of the Word to the 5th Verse of the *History of Susanna*, I have read it over. and can find no such Thing. I find indeed at the 50th Verse, the Word *Πρεσβυτεριον* us'd in that Sense, but not the Word *Πρεσβυτεριον* concerning which the Dispute is.

Mr. Dr ——— as his last Refuge betakes himself to a desperate Shift, and tells us “ That tho' he shou'd grant, “ that the *Presbyters* did join with St. Paul in laying their “ Hands on *Timothy*, yet it was St. Paul only ordain'd, who “ call'd to his Assistance some inferior Officers in this one “ Instance for the greater Solemnity of the Action, or “ perhaps to give countenance to *Timothy's* Youth. “ And he thinks this evident from Paul and Barnabas “ ordaining *Presbyters* in every Church, where (as he well “ observes) there were no *Presbyters* before to join with “ 'em.” Nay, he has the Confidence to tell us, “ That tho' in the Establish'd Church, some *Presbyters* “ join with the *Bishop* in laying on of Hands, 'tis the “ *Bishop* only that ordains.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. That the *Apostles* could alone ordain *Presbyters* in Churches where there were none before, I freely grant: But if where *Presbyters* were constituted, they concurr'd with 'em in Ordinations, 'tis a plain Demonstration, that the Power of Ordaining did belong to 'em.

And



And therefore Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Remark carries another Force and Weight with it, than our *Author's* precarious Supposition. Having told us, "That every one who is himself advanc'd to the Authority of a Church-Governor hath an internal Power of conferring the same on Persons fit for it. To which Purpose (saith he) *the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*, is no wise impertinently alledg'd, altho' we suppose St. Paul to concur in the *Action* (as it is most probable he did.) Because if the *Presbytery* had nothing to do in the *Ordination*, to what Purpose were *their Hands laid on him*? Was it only to be *Witnesses* of the *Fact*, or to signify their *Consent*? Both these might have been done without their *Use* of that *Ceremony*. Which will scarce be instanc'd in to be done by any, but such as had Power to confer what was signify'd by that *Ceremony*, *Irenic. 275.* Mr. Dr—— indeed here tells us, "That all the Difficulty will be reconcil'd, if St. Paul be suffer'd to enjoy the Honour of giving unto *Timothy* by the *imposition of Hands*, the *Gifts* and *Graces* of the Holy Spirit, which were necessary to enable him to perform the Work of a Minister of Christ, and the *Presbytery* be permitted not to want their Share in the Performance of the *outward Ceremony*." And to that Purpose he cites *Bishop Billson*.

*Answ.* If none have the Power of *Ordaining* but such as can by the *Imposition of their Hands* give the *Gifts* and *Graces* of the Holy Spirit, I am afraid, That 'tis wholly lost in the Church. For I do not find that *Diocesan Bishops* themselves pretend to it; at least we are sure it does not appear by the Character of too many whom they ordain, both with respect to their *Intellectuals* and *Morals*, that they exert any such Power if they have it: So that if an Ability of bestowing such Gifts be requisite to the Power of *Ordaining*, there are now no *Ordinations* at all. If it be not, what shall we make of *Bishop Billson's* and Mr. *Drury's* reasoning on this Head? But I had thought that *Ordaining* does imply, not the giving those *Gifts* and *Graces*, but the

setting apart such to whom there is reasonable Ground to believe that they are *already given*, to the *Work* of the *Ministry*, which those *Gifts* and *Graces* qualify'd 'em for. And this may be done by those that pretend to no *Power* of giving such *Gifts* and *Graces* at all; this therefore can be no Reason, why the *Presbyters* should be only allow'd a *Share* in performing the outward Ceremony, Which is indeed only to make the *Imposition of their Hands* an insignificant Cypher. They had (as Dr. Stillingfleet observes) other Ways enough to signify their Consent, and to let the Church know that such a *Sacred Action* was not done rashly, or out of Favour and Affection. There was no Need of the *Imposition of their Hands* to that End, if they had no *Power* of setting others apart to the like *Ministerial Work* in which they were engag'd themselves; and therefore if the *Apostle* join'd with 'em herein, 'tis much more reasonable to conclude, that this was a *Work* that belong'd to all ordinary *Pastors*, viz. to commit that *Doctrine* to others which they were impower'd to preach themselves. 'Tis no wonder indeed for such a *Papist* as *Eftius* to tell us, That the *Presbyters* only perform'd the outward Ceremony, but St. Paul what was essential to the *Sacrament of Orders*. But for Mr. Dr ——— to deliver such a *Popish Fagment* for an *Oracle*, is not much for his Credit, and looks too like countenancing the Dream of an *Indelible Character*.

Again, *Bishop Bilson's* and Mr. Dr ———'s Reasoning is very weak, when they argue, that because St. Paul could have ordain'd *Timothy* alone, that therefore their joining with him could no way argue the *Presbyters* ordaining Power, but only their bare performing the outward Rite. By the ancient *Canons* three *Parochial Bishops* were reckon'd a sufficient Number to ordain a *Parochial Bishop*, will it thence follow, that when two or three more concurr'd in the Ordination, that their *Imposition of Hands* was the bare Performance of the outward Ceremony, and signify'd nothing to investing the Person ordain'd with *Episcopal Authority*. I doubt not but in Cases of Necessity one *Pastor* may ordain, but it

does

does no  
in the  
mental  
indeed  
whose  
others,  
more t  
Euchar  
Sacram  
in the  
solid a  
given  
Power.  
That  
ordain  
the co  
the P  
to his  
ring f  
minif  
to cor  
Churc  
'em b  
maki  
Hand  
Acco  
more  
than  
pos'd  
scury  
selve  
T  
quit  
earl  
chia  
tion  
Scri  
nat  
nei

does not thence follow, that when more join with him in the *Imposition of Hands*, that they are not as *Instrumental* in conveying *Ministerial Authority* as he. And indeed none shou'd lay on Hands at all, but such to whose Office it belongs to commit the same Doctrine to others, which themselves are publick Teachers of: No more than any shou'd consecrate the Elements in the *Eucharist*, who were never impowr'd to administer that Sacrament. The *Presbyters* concurrence with St. Paul in the *Imposition of Hands* on *Timothy*, is therefore as solid a Proof of their ordaining Power, as the Charge given to *Timothy* to lay on Hands is of his ordaining Power. Nay as I observ'd before, 'tis not certain, That St. Paul laid Hands on *Timothy* in Order to the ordaining him at all; because it might be in Order to the conferring extraordinary Gifts on him: Whereas if the *Presbyters* laid their's on him, it must be in Order to his Ordination, because they had no Power of conferring such Gifts, tho' they had of setting him apart to that ministerial Work wherein he was to be exercis'd. And to conclude this Head, the *Presbyters* of the *Establish'd Church*, have just Reason to resent this Indignity offer'd 'em by Mr. Dr—— and those of his Principles, for making their joining with the Bishop in the *Imposition of Hands*, a meer Cypher and empty Formality. For by this Account, the laying on of their Hands signifies no more to the Conveyance of ministerial Authority, than if the Hands of so many of the *Laity* were impos'd. How therefore they will relish Mr. Dr——'s scurvy Complement upon them, I must leave to themselves.

The Result of this Matter then is in short, all *Antiquity* allows the ordaining Power of *Parochial Bishops*; the earliest Ages allow'd even the ordaining Power of *Parochial Curates* or *Presbyters*; the Scriptures expressly mention the Concurrence of *Presbyters* in Ordination. Both Scripture and Antiquity do therefore warrant our Ordinations that are perform'd by *Parochial Bishops*: But neither of 'em so much as mention a *Diocesan Bishop*, much



much less do they appropriate the Power of Ordination to any such Bishop. And yet this Gentleman would persuade us, that Ordination does by Divine Right belong to them only, and that the Concurrence of Parochial Bishops with 'em therein, is a meer Cypher.

This being the true State of the Case, I need not insist long on the Vindication of that Passage of Dr. Burnet's, viz. "That since the Sacramental Actions are the highest of sacred Performances, those that are empower'd for them must be of the highest Office in the Church." All Bishop Taylor's Answers to it, are but a plain begging the Question. And he has not offer'd the least tolerable Reason, why he that is himself authoriz'd to teach in the Church may not commit that Doctrine to others, and why he that is empower'd to dispense the Sacraments himself, may not ministerially invest others in the same Office? Why may not Physicians license a Physician? And that this Ordaining Power is by Divine Right, appropriated to any Order of Men distinct from Congregational Pastors or Presbyter-Bishops, is an Opinion that (as I have shewn him) has no Foundation either in Scripture or Antiquity.

Mr. Dr—— concludes this Chapter, by considering the Case of the Chorepiscopi among the Ancients. On which I need only make the following Remarks.

1. 'Tis utterly untrue, that these Chorepiscopi or Rural Bishops, were not heard of in the Church till the Fourth Century. Clemens Romanus assures us, that the Apostles constituted Bishops and Deacons not only in the Cities but Countrey, \* wherever there was a sufficient Number of Christians to make up a Church. These Rural Bishops are mention'd in the Council of Antioch, held A. D. 270. And in Africa they were so numerous, that as several learned Antiquaries well observe, almost every good Village had a Bishop.

\* See Clement's Words before Pag. 35.

The Truth is, while the *Churches* retain'd the *Simplicity* and *Humility* of the *Apostolical Age*, wherever there were Christians enough to make up a *Church*, they had their *Bishop* or *Pastor*, and usually some *Assistants*, whether in *City* or *Country*. No *Cities* for above *Two Centuries* (if we except *Rome* and *Alexandria*) had more *Assemblies* than one under the *Bishop's* Government; and few *Country-Villages* had Numbers enough of Converts to make up a *Church*. But as Christianity made a greater Progress, and a competent Number of Converts occasion'd the Erection of new *Assemblies* in *Country-Villages*, so they had their *Rural Bishops*. But as the *Bishops* plac'd in *Cities* and *Towns*, begun in the latter End of the *Third* and in the *Fourth Century*, to lay some Claim to those *Country-Villages* as dependent on them, so they first by *Canons* endeavour'd to bring those *Rural Bishops* into some Subjection to 'em; and as Ambition encreas'd, they gradually put 'em down to enlarge the Extent of their own *Districts*.

2. 'Tis not true, That any *Rural Bishops* had several Churches under them in the Three First Centuries, nor generally in the Fourth or Fifth. Nor do the Words of the Council of *Ancyra* cited by Mr. Dr—— prove any such Thing.

3. I am not therefore at all concern'd in the Dispute, whether these *Rural Bishops* are to be rank'd among *Presbyters*, or among *Bishops* according to the Distinction between 'em, that obtain'd in the Three First Centuries. I doubt not they were as truly *Bishops* as any planted in *Cities*, and had the same Power. And the *Canons* that first subjected 'em to the *City Bishops*, and those that afterwards forbad the constituting *Bishops* in *Villages*, least the Name of a *Bishop* shou'd grow cheap and contemptible, I take to be the first Steps of that Ambition, that in the following Ages made so swift Advances by one *Parochial Bishops* swallowing up several smaller *Parishes* to enlarge his own, by *Metropolitans* subjecting the *City Bishops* to them, and by the *Patriarchs* bringing them under their Power, till at last the

the *Roman Bishop* overtopp'd 'em all, and brought so great a Part of the Christian Church into a miserable Vassalage to his own usurped *Supremacy*. A Consideration that shou'd make all considerate Persons, cautious of applauding such Deviations from the Humility and Simplicity of the Apostolical Age, and much more of pretending a *Divine Right* for the first Steps and Attempts of that humane Ambition, that has in the Progress of it prov'd so fatal both to the Purity of the Church, and even to that *Unity* and *Peace* of it, which was the most plausible Pretence for the greatest of these *Incroachments* and *Usurpations*.

Upon the Whole, [Mr. Dr—— may see, how lame and defective his Argument drawn from the Power of *Ordination* is. He has not prov'd, that the *Presbyters* or *Parochial Curates* were excluded from the Power of *Ordination*; much less that they were so by *Divine Right*. He has not one Syllable to prove, that *Congregational Bishops*, or *Parochial Rectors* were excluded; for these are the *Primitive Bishops* that were chiefly concern'd in *Ordinations*. All the *Ordinations* in the *Dissenting Churches* at Home, and in the *Reform'd Churches* Abroad that are not under *Diocesan Episcopacy*, are perform'd by such *Congregational Bishops* or *Parochial Rectors*. Mr. Dr—— shou'd therefore have shewn us by what *Divine Right* these *Parochial Bishops* are depriv'd of their Power of *Ordination*, and the *Diocesan Bishop* appropriates it to himself? But this I do not find that he has in the least attempted: Whereas without solidly proving this, his Cause is given up; for whether *meer Curates* have the Power of *Ordination*, is not a Matter we are concern'd in, who have no such among us. But that the *Establish'd Church* does own such a Power of *Ordaining* in *Parochial Rectors*, is evident from her appointing their Concurrence with the *Diocesan* in his *Ordinations*. And 'tis no better than an Affront to the *Establish'd Church*, to suppose her guilty of so great an Absurdity, as that of ordering their Concurrence in the external Rite, who have no Manner of *Interest* or *Right* in the Ministerial Convey-



ance of the Thing signify'd by it: For their Concurrence on that Supposition, is (as I observ'd before) not only useless but dangerous.

## REMARKS on CHAP. IV.

**I** Now come to consider Mr. Dr——'s *Fourth Chapter*, wherein he pretends to prove, *the Bishops to be the immediate Successors of the Apostles.*

And here Mr. Dr—— undertakes to prove, I. "That the Apostolical Office in the Ordinary and Essential Parts of it was to continue forever. And II. That those whom we now call Bishops do succeed the Apostles in their Apostolical Office. And III. To consider Mr. B's Objections against it.

He begins with the

I. To prove, *That the Apostolical Office in the Ordinary and Essential Parts of it was to continue for ever in the Church.*

What he means by the *Ordinary and Essential Parts* of it, he explains p. 70. viz. *The supreme Spiritual Power and Authority, and a Power of Ordaining, i. e. the transmitting this Authority to others, and this he calls the whole Plenitude of Ecclesiastical Power.*

*Ans.* What are we the Wiser for all this, when he never tells us, wherein this *supream Power and Authority* consists? I shall therefore briefly go thro' their several Powers, and shew which were common to them with ordinary Pastors, and which were peculiar to the Apostles, and distinctive Characters of their superior Office.

They had a Power of being Teachers in the Christian Church. But all Divines have been wont to distinguish between such extraordinary Teachers, as had the Promise of the perpetual unerring Assistance of the Holy Spirit in delivering the Doctrine of Christ, and whose

whose Doctrine is therefore represented as the *Foundation* on which the Church is built, *Eph. II. 20. v.* And between *ordinary Teachers* that have no such unerring Assistance, and to whose Doctrine we are no farther oblig'd to assent than we find it agreeable to that of these inspired Teachers. That the *Apostles* have *Successors* in the Office of Teaching the Christian Doctrine in general, we freely grant; that they have *Successors* as *inspired Teachers*, to whom the same Promise of the perpetual unerring Assistance of the Holy Spirit belongs, is indeed strongly pleaded by all the *Sticklers* for the *Infallibility* of *Popes* and *General Councils*, but is deny'd by all *Protestants*, and particularly by the Church of *England* in her 19th and 20th *Articles*. Here then is an *Authority* in Teaching, founded upon a peculiar *Privilege* and *Promise*, that is peculiar to the *Apostles*, and can be deriv'd to no *Successors*; but the *Power* of Teaching in general is deriv'd to all *Pastors* whatever.

They had a *Power* of admitting *Men* into the *Christian Church* by *Baptism*. Herein we freely allow, that the *Apostles* are to have *Successors*. But this *Power* Mr. Dr—— himself will not pretend to be peculiar to any distinct *Order* or *Pastors* in the Church, any more than the former of Teaching.

There is a *Power* of being *Guides* in *Acts* of *Publick Worship*. In this we also grant, that the *Apostles* have *Successors*, and Mr. Dr—— himself will not suppose this confin'd to any distinct *Order* of *Pastors* in the Church. But here I must subjoin, that there is a *Power* or *Authority* of delivering such positive *Institutions* to the Church as they receiv'd from *Christ*, *1 Cor. XI. 23, &c.* which the *Apostles* claim'd, and wherein they can have no *Successors*, unless any such pretend to the same *immediate Inspiration* as they had: So that here is another distinguishing *Character* of their *Apostolical Office*.

There is a *Power* of *Censuring* scandalous *Offenders*, and casting 'em out of the Church. In this also we grant, that the *Apostles* were to have *Successors*: But as to this *Power* I have already shewn him, that there were such

Rulers

Rulers  
judge  
riously  
one u  
1 Cor.  
But  
some n  
Bodily  
cular  
their  
that t  
on hai  
Comm  
The  
roneous  
Declar  
to be  
tance  
warn'd  
em;  
Neighb  
Matter  
mainta  
stor, or  
guilty c  
Power,  
this no  
in thei  
this Ju  
cause t  
is the  
stles, no  
unlimit  
all Past  
bunde  
in this  
ly Dec  
it, we  
nor do

*Rulers in every Christian Church as were authoriz'd to judge those that were within, and to cast out any notoriously wicked Person, nay to forgive and restore such a one upon a credible Profession of their Repentance, 1 Cor. V. 11, 12. and 2 Cor. II. 7 v.*

But there was a miraculous Power of Delivering up some notorious Sinners to Satan, in Order to the inflicting Bodily Diseases, or other Punishments; And this was peculiar to the Apostles, and another distinctive Character of their Office. And it was by the Exercise of this Power that they did in some Cases enforce that Sentence pass'd on heinous Offenders whereby they were cast out of the Communion of the Church.

There is a Power of censuring scandalous or grossly erroneous Pastors themselves. If it be meant only of a Declarative Power, whereby their Crimes or Errors are to be publicly notified, they declar'd without Repentance or Recantation unfit for their Office, and the People warn'd against owning them as Pastors, and adhering to them; in this also the Apostles have Successors, viz. those Neighbouring associated Pastors, to whose cognizance such Matters properly belong, and who are concern'd to maintain a Fraternal Communion with the Accused Pastor, or to renounce it, accordingly as they find him guilty or innocent. But if it be meant of such a Judicial Power, whose Censure is to be absolutely submitted to; this none can claim but such who are secur'd from erring in their Sentence by an unerring Assistance: And in this Judicial Power the Apostles have no Successors, because they have none in that unerring Assistance, that is the only warrantable Ground of it. But the Apostles not only might claim such a Judicial Power but an unlimited one in the Extent of it, equally reaching to all Pastors thro the Christian Church, and that cou'd be bounded by no humane Agreements and Compacts. And in this Power both consider'd as Judicial and not merely Declarative, and as thus unlimited in the Exercise of it, we deny the Apostles to have any Successors at all; nor do any Bishops now pretend to it, unless the Bishop  
of



of Rome, or the *Papish Bishops* in their falsely pretended *General Councils*.

There is a *Power of making Laws or Canons* relating to the *Circumstances and Modes of Worship or Discipline* that are necessary in general, but left undetermin'd in particular. Now either this *Power* must be suppos'd *Obligatory* to the whole *Christian Church*, or to particular Churches, and those either *single Congregations*, or *Diocesan*, or *Metropolitanical*, or *National Churches*?

For the *Catholick Church*, None can without usurping the *Headship* of *Christ*, make *Laws or Canons* obligatory to it, unless it be such as are made by *immediate Inspiration*, and deliver'd in the *Holy Scriptures*; and then, they are as much the *Laws of Christ* himself as any other deliver'd there. For *Provincial*, or *Metropolitan*, or *National Churches*, that had *Diocesan Bishops* or *Archbishops*, or any such *Rulers* as the *Ecclesiastick Head*, or *Pars Imperans* of such govern'd *Societies*, we can find none such in the *Apostle's Days*, nor for *Two or Three Centuries* after them; and therefore can find no such *Successors* appointed to the *Apostles* in this *Power*. We find indeed *Parochial* or *Congregational Pastors* (at first endued with *equal Authority*, but by *Degrees* some of them brought into the like *Subjection* to one, as the *Chief Pastor*, that *Curates* are to *Parish-Rectors*.) And by these *Parochial Bishops*, and their *Assistent Presbyters*, such *Circumstances* were at first determin'd for their particular *Congregations*; and that with great *Variety* and *Liberty*; till for *Unity* sake several such *Parochial Bishops* and *Presbyters* met in *Provincial Synods*, and agreed on common *Rules or Canons* about such *Matters*. And after *Constantine's Time* *Imperial Councils* (falsely call'd *General* or *Oecumenical*, for they had not so much as *Deputies* from the *Extra-Imperial Churches*) often made such *Rules* for all the Churches within the *Bounds* of the *Roman Empire*. And in this, they pretended the *apostolical Council* at *Jerusalem Acts XV.* for their *Pattern*. But since the *Apostles* had no other *Successors* for about *Three Centuries*, than *Parochial Pastors* (dis-

tinguish'd

distinguish'd probably in the Second Century into *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, as now into *Rectors* and *Curates*;) if this *Power* be deriv'd from *them*, it must devolve on *Parochial Pastors* and their *Assistants*, who are indeed chiefly concern'd in the Determination of such undetermin'd Circumstances: But then this *Power* must be duly *limited*, and no associated Body of such *Pastors* must claim an implicate and blind *Subjection* to their *Decisions*, unless they cou'd pretend to such an unerring Assistance as that *Apostolical Council* had, when they cou'd say, *it seem'd good to the Holy Ghost and to us*, Acts. XV.

For the *Power of Ordination*, I have already shewn Mr. Dr—— That the *Apostles* never appropriated it to *themselves*, or to any particular Order of Men. That *Presbyters* and ordinary *Teachers* are suppos'd by them *vested* with it, and did actually *exercise* it. That all such *Parochial Bishops* as (with *Deacons*) were constituted in every Church, are suppos'd by St. *Clement* to be *possessed* of it. That it was, after the Distinction between *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, exercis'd by the *Parochial Bishops* (the *Presbyters* concurring with 'em when a *Presbyter* was to be ordain'd.) This *Power* being common to ordinary *Teachers*, as well as *Apostles*, *Prophets*, and *Evangelists*, was therefore no distinctive Character of any particular Order.

From this brief Enumeration of *Particulars*, it appears, that the *Apostles* had several *Branches* of *Ecclesiastical Power* peculiar to themselves, distinguishing them from all ordinary *Pastors*, and founded upon the Promise of extraordinary Assistance, that are therefore no more derivable to any *Successors* than that extraordinary Assistance is; and therefore the Plenitude of their *Ecclesiastical Power* is not communicable to any *Successors*.

But for those *Branches* of *Spiritual Power* that are not founded on such extraordinary *Assistances* and peculiar *Privileges*, we freely grant they have *Successors* in 'em. And Mr. Dr—— needed not have taken any Pains to prove it.

But if he still insist upon it, That as to these ordinary Powers, such as that of being *Teachers, Guides in publick Worship, Rulers and Ordainers of others*, the Apostles divided these Powers, and left all of 'em to one Sort of ordinary Pastors, and only some of 'em to others, this is what he has brought us no tolerable Evidence for. Nay that Power of Ruling in the Church, which he had suppos'd the most distinctive Character of a Superior Office, the Apostle Paul supposes on the contrary, to belong to all Presbyters that labour in Word and Doctrine, and to be but an Inferior and less honourable Branch of their Power, 1 Tim. V. 17. And therefore when he enjoins, that double Honour shou'd be paid to the Elders that rule well, he adds, but especially to them that labour in Word and Doctrine. From whence it evidently follows, that there are no Teachers in the Christian Church, that are not also Rulers in it. And I have already vindicated that Passage, wherein the Apostle supposes these Presbyters invested with the Power of Ordination.

That upon the Death of Judas one was to be substituted in his Place, is true; but nothing to the Author's Purpose. For that Number of Twelve had a peculiar Relation to the Jews, to whom the Apostles were first sent with the Offers of Salvation.

Whether Barnabas was as truly an Apostle as St. Paul, is not a Matter that the Cause is at all concern'd in. When the Gospel was to be propagated to the Gentile World, our Blessed Lord might give others as well as St. Paul the same extraordinary Commission and Gifts that he had. That Paul was first ordain'd a Presbyter by Ananias, and then an Apostle by the Prophets and Teachers of Antioch, is but a precarious and improbable Supposition: And 'tis I think sufficiently confuted by the Apostle himself. For it was before he came to Damascus and had ever seen Ananias, that he had his Commission from Christ himself, who said unto him, *I am Jesus whom thou persecutest, but rise and stand upon thy Feet, for I have appear'd unto thee for this Purpose, to*

make



make thee a Minister and Witness, both of these Things which thou hast seen, and of those Things in the which I will appear unto thee, delivering thee from the People and the Gentiles, unto whom I now SEND thee, [*Ἀποστείλω σε*] To open their Eyes, and to turn 'em from Darkness to Light, &c. *Acts XXVI. 15, 16, 17, 18.* And if this be not a Commission sufficient to constitute him an Apostle, we may as well doubt whether Christ constituted any Apostles at all. For *Ananias*, We read indeed of his putting his Hands upon him, but it was neither to ordain him a Presbyter, nor an Apostle; (for he had already receiv'd his Apostolical Commission from our Blessed Lord personally appearing to him for that End,) but that he might receive his Sight, and be fill'd with the Holy Ghost. See *IX. Acts 12th* compar'd with *v. 17, 18th.* He was indeed at *Acts XIII. 2, 3.* set apart to a peculiar Service by Fasting and Prayer, and Imposition of Hands; but his Apostolical Commission was given before. But shou'd we suppose him then ordain'd an Apostle, there is a material Circumstance mention'd that wou'd entirely ruin Mr. Dr——'s Cause, viz. That the ordinary Teachers of the Church of Antioch concurr'd with the Prophets in that Ordination, and that by the Direction of the Holy Spirit. And if they cou'd ordain an Apostle, 'tis absurd to think 'em incapable of ordaining such ordinary Teachers as themselves. Nay, 'tis a Demonstration, that the Ordainers give not the Power, but may ministerially invest a Man in an higher Office than what themselves have in the Church: Whereas I plead for no more at present, than for their Capacity to vest a Man in the same Office.

Mr. Dr—— in his Third Section of this Chapter, before he attempts to prove Bishops the Successors of the Apostles, premises "That the Extent of a Diocess is not essential to a Bishoprick." And when he says, "The Bishops succeed the Apostles, he does not mean, that 'tis necessary, That they shou'd succeed to this or that particular District, but in their Power and Jurisdiction, so that they had a Commission given 'em of

“ doing something that *Presbyters* cou’d not do by their  
“ *Commission*.

*Ans.* I have already distinguish’d between the *ordinary Powers common* with the Apostles to all the Pastors they constituted in particular Churches, and the *extraordinary Ones* founded on their *extraordinary Assistances and Gifts*. That any *succeed* ’em in those *extraordinary Powers* is evidently confuted by Experience, because none *succeed* ’em in the *extraordinary Assistances and Gifts* on which they were founded. For the *ordinary Powers*, Mr. Dr—— has brought no manner of Proof that they *divided* ’em, and gave *all* to *one Order* of Ecclesiastical Persons, and *some* only to *others*. On the contrary, I have shewn him, the *Power of Ruling* is inseparable from that of *Teaching*, and only *subservient* to it; and so does the *Power of ordaining* belong to *ordinary Teachers*. *Presbyter-Bishops* are mention’d in Scripture as *exercising both*; but of *Bishops* as distinct from *Presbyters*, the *New Testament* (as the *Authors of the Erudition of a Christian Man*, and of the *Declaration of their Function*, &c. have well observ’d) makes no mention at all.

But if the *Extent of a Diocese* be not essential to a *Bishoprick*, if a Man may be a *Bishop* that has only a *single Congregation* as his *ordinary Charge*, then what hinders all the *Pastors* of the *Reformed Churches Abroad* that want the *Diocesan Form of Government*, and all those of *Dissenting Churches* at Home from being *Bishops*? For their *Ordainers* invested ’em in all those *Ordinary Powers* that any Man can *succeed* the Apostles in. How comes then all this Out-cry against ’em as *Rejecters of Episcopacy*? For they have the same *Episcopal Powers* that the *Bishops of Ephesus*, or those of *Philippi* had, they are invested therein by such *Bishops*; they have all the *Powers* the ancient *Parochial Bishops* claim’d; they have only laid aside that *Diocesan Episcopacy* that wou’d deprive these *Congregational Bishops* of several *Branches* of their *Power*, to engross it into their own Hand. They have only disclaim’d what

they ac  
they ca  
cession  
prove l  
Dioces  
Right, i  
gations,  
fore the  
darknin  
Light.  
nothing  
large D  
it away  
Diocess  
ment,  
Pastors  
tion of  
Etabl  
they m  
restor’d  
But for  
sistica  
Apost  
cessors  
actual  
fess se  
fairly  
For  
Chapte  
dinatio  
them  
ters, I  
such n  
less a  
festly  
Tha  
copacy  
Apost  
byters

they account an Invasion on their own Rights which they can see no *Divine Warrant* for. So that this Con-  
 cession entirely ruins Mr. Dr —'s Cause, and he'll  
 prove but a miserable Defender of the *Divine Right of*  
*Diocesan Episcopacy*, if he grant that 'tis not of *Divine*  
*Right*, that their Authority shou'd extend to several Congre-  
 gations, and the Teachers or Pastors of 'em. To state there-  
 fore the ordinary Extent of the Bishop's Power is so far from  
 darkning the Cause, that 'tis thereby brought into a true  
 Light. And Mr. Dr — by telling us, that it signifies  
 nothing to the Bishop's Power, whether he exercise it in a  
 large Diocess or single Congregation, has evidently given  
 it away: For if the Bishop's exercising it over a large  
 Diocess, be wholly owing to humane Compact and Agree-  
 ment, that Compact may be broken, and all Parish-  
 Pastors resume their ancient Rights, without the viola-  
 tion of a *Divine Right*. And on this Supposition the  
 Establish'd Church of North-Britain, has only broke what  
 they reckon'd an unreasonable humane Compact, and  
 restor'd Episcopacy to its Primitive Parochial Bounds:  
 But for what he calls the Plenitude of the Apostles Eccle-  
 siastical Power, they had all the ordinary Branches of the  
 Apostolical Power (that can be transmitted to any Suc-  
 cessors) committed to 'em in their Ordination, and  
 actually exercise 'em. Mr. Dr — has therefore I con-  
 fess set Mr. B. right in this Controversy, but 'tis by  
 fairly giving up the main Point in Dispute.

For what he pretends to have prov'd in the former  
 Chapter, viz. that Confirmation, Excommunication, Or-  
 dination, were Acts peculiar to the Apostles, and by  
 them convey'd to Bishops as distinct from meer Presby-  
 ters, I have already consider'd it, and shewn him that no  
 such meer Presbyters are to be found in the Bible, much  
 less a Diocesan Bishop, tho' Presbyter-Bishops are mani-  
 festly extant there.

That the Apostolical Office is call'd Ἐπισκοπή, an Epis-  
 copacy or Inspection, I freely grant. And so do the  
 Apostles call themselves Presbyters, nay, Fellow-Pres-  
 byters with such Presbyters as had the Inspection of



particular Flocks, which Presbyters they require *Ἐμμεν-  
πειν* to act the Part of Bishops, or to take Inspection of  
those Flocks; but how this shou'd prove Bishops as dis-  
tinguish'd from Presbyters, to be the Apostles Successors  
in the Plenitude of their Ecclesiastical Power, I cannot  
understand.

Mr. Dr.—'s Arguments from the Scriptures being ut-  
terly defective, he endeavours to support 'em from An-  
tiquity.

That the Apostles divided the known Parts of the  
World among 'em by Lots, is a meer precarious Suppo-  
sition, which Mr. Dr.— may see so fully confuted by  
the learned Dr. Stillingfleet, by no less than Eight un-  
answerable Arguments, that I shall refer the Reader to  
'em. He'll find 'em, *Irenic. Part. II. ch. VI. p. 233,—  
237.* But because I take the Controversy to be little  
concern'd in this Matter of Fact, I shall take no further  
Notice of this Dream. But if Mr. Dr.— will shew  
us any other Bishops the Apostles left in the Churches  
they settled, as the stated Governors of 'em than Paro-  
chial Pastors, or shew us one Diocesan Bishop they con-  
stituted, his Proofs shall be consider'd.

To prove that the Apostolate and Episcopate signify'd  
the same Ecclesiastical Power and Authority, to continue  
for ever in the Church,

His First Evidence is *Irenaeus*.

Now, because I wou'd set this Matter in its true  
Light, I must premise, That the Question is not whe-  
ther the Apostles have Successors in the Ordinary Branches  
of their Power, such as Teaching, Administring the Sa-  
craments, exercising Church-Censures, Ordaining, &c.  
But I. Whether the Ancients did think, that they di-  
vided these Powers so as to appropriate some of 'em to  
a peculiar Order of Men. And II. If they suppos'd  
'em appropriated to one Order, viz. That of Bishops,  
whether it was Parochial or Diocesan Bishops that they  
suppos'd 'em appropriated to? For Mr. Dr.— must  
prove both these, if he wou'd make any Use of the Te-  
stimony of Antiquity in the Cause he has undertaken.

For

For  
count  
any M  
the R  
Light  
Th  
" aga  
" Tra  
" serv  
" the  
" ser  
" fle  
(b)  
" obl  
" fle  
" up  
" by  
" Ti  
" as  
" an

(a)  
que p  
eos ;  
etiam  
*Irenae*  
(b)  
omni  
mus a  
& suc  
nover  
Apos  
vel m  
Vald  
quos  
tes.  
nium  
omni  
ma f  
ditio  
rum  
Ibid.

For *Irenaus*, I shall (to give the Reader a true Account of his Judgment) set all I can meet with of any Moment in that ancient *Author*, at once before the Reader's View, because the several Passages give Light to one another.

Thus speaking of some Hereticks, he saith, “(a) When again, we challenge ’em by appealing to that Tradition which is from the *Apostles*, which is preserv’d in the Churches by the Successions of *Presbyters*; they oppose Tradition and say that they, being wiser not only than the *Presbyters*, but than the *Apostles*, have found out the uncorrupted Truth, &c.

(b) “ All therefore who would see the Truth, may observe in every Church the Tradition of the *Apostles* manifested in all the World; and we can reckon up those who were appointed *Bishops* in the Churches by the *Apostles*, and who were their Successors to our Time, who neither taught nor knew any such Thing as these Men dream of. For had the *Apostles* known any hidden Mysteries, which they had a Mind to

---

(a) Cum autem ad eam iterum Traditionem, quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per Successiones Presbyterorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus eos; adversantur Traditioni, dicentes se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes sapientiores, sinceram invenisse veritatem. *Irenæi advers. Hæres. Lib. III. cap. 2. p. 200.*

(b) Traditionem itaque Apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni Ecclesiâ adest perspicere omnibus qui vera velint videre, & habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, & successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur. Etenim si recondita mysteria scissent Apostoli, quæ seorsim & lateater ab reliquis perfectos docebant, his vel maximè traderent ea quibus etiam ipsas Ecclesias committebant. Valdè enim perfectos & irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse, quos & successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes. — Sed quoniam valdè longum est, in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones; maximæ & antiquissimæ & omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro & Paulo Romæ fundatæ & constitutæ Ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis Traditionem, & annunciatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, &c. *Ibid. cap. 3. p. 200, 201.*

“ deliver to such as were perfect, privately, and apart  
 “ from the rest, they wou’d have chiefly deliver’d ’em  
 “ to those to whom they committed the Churches them-  
 “ selves : For they wou’d have them to be very per-  
 “ fect and unblameable in all Things, whom they left  
 “ as *Successors*, delivering to ’em their own Place, of  
 “ being *Teachers*, (or as some render it, their own  
 “ Place of *Authority* : ) But because ’tis long in such a  
 “ Volume as this, to reckon up the *Succession* of all  
 “ Churches; by pointing out the *Tradition* and declared  
 “ Faith of that greatest, and most ancient and noted  
 “ Church founded at *Rome* by two most glorious Apo-  
 “ stles *Peter* and *Paul*, which she has from the Apo-  
 “ stles, and is come to us by the *Succession* of *Bishops*,  
 “ we confound all those, &c.” And then he mentions  
 the *Succession* of *Linus*, *Anacletus*, *Clemens*, *Euaristus*,  
*Alexander*, *Sixtus*, *Telesphorus*, *Hyginus*, *Pius*, *Anicetus*,  
*Soter*, *Eleutherius* : And afterwards *Polycarp* Bishop of  
 the Church of *Smyrna*.

(c) “ Wherefore we ought to obey those *Presbyters*  
 “ that are in the Church, that have their *Succession* from  
 “ the *Apostles* (as we have shewn) and who with the  
 “ *Succession* of *Episcopacy*, have receiv’d the certain Gift  
 “ of Truth, according to the good Pleasure of the  
 “ Father.

(d) Having described wicked *Presbyters*, he adds,  
 “ From such we ought to depart, but to adhere to those

---

(c) Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt Presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus; qui cum episcopatus successionem charisma veritatis certum, secundum placitum Patris acceperunt. Lib. IV. cap. 43. p. 343.

(d) Ab omnibus igitur talibus abstinere oportet; adherere vero his qui & Apostolorum doctrinam custodiunt, & cum Presbyterii ordine sermonem sanum & conversationem sine offensa præstant. — Tales Presbyteros nutrit Ecclesia; de quibus & Propheta ait, Et dabo principes tuos in Pace, & Episcopos tuos in justitia. De quibus & Dominus dicebat, Quis igitur erit fidelis actor, bonus & sapiens, quem præponit Dominus super familiam suam, ad danda eis cibaria in tempore? Ibid. cap. 44. p. 344. 345.

“ who



“ who keep the Doctrine of the Apostles, and with  
 “ the Order of *Presbytery* maintain sound Doctrine, and  
 “ a blameless Conversation, &c. Such *Presbyters* the  
 “ Church does nourish, concerning whom the *Prophet*  
 “ also saith, I will give thee *Princes in Peace*, and *Bi-*  
 “ *shops in Righteousness*. Of whom our Lord also said,  
 “ Who therefore is that faithful, and good, and wise  
 “ Servant, whom his Master may set over his House,  
 “ to give 'em their Food in due Season ?

(e) Again, “ He attributes to all *Teachers*, that *Suc-*  
 “ *cession* of the Church that is from the Apostles.  
 “ And then relates what Doctrine he had receiv'd from  
 “ a certain *Presbyter*, that had receiv'd it from such as  
 “ saw and convers'd with the *Apostles*.

Now upon the Review of these Passages of *Irenæus*,  
 we may plainly see, That that ancient *Writer* never  
 thought *Bishops* a distinct Order from *Presbyters*. That  
 Christian Doctrine which in some Passages he supposes  
 handed down to his Age by the *Succession* of *Bishops*,  
 he does in others assert to be transmitted by the *Suc-*  
*cession* of *Presbyters*. Nay, he ascribes the *Succession*  
 of *Episcopacy* to the *Presbyters*; He applies to *Presby-*  
*ters* that Passage of the *Prophet*, wherein he speaks of  
 God's giving 'em *Princes in Peace*, and *Bishops in Righ-*  
*teousness*. And having distinguish'd between *Apostles*,  
 and *Prophets*, and *Teachers*, he ascribes this *Succession*  
 from the Apostles to such *Teachers*.

To evade the Force of this plain Evidence, Mr.  
 Dr—— has recourse to two desperate Shifts.

The One is to perswade us, “ That when *Irenæus*  
 “ appeals to that *Tradition* of the Christian Doctrine,  
 “ which is preserv'd by the *Succession* of *Presbyters*, he

---

(e) Ubi igitur tales inveniatur aliquis, Paulus docens ait : *Posuit*  
*Deus in Ecclesia primò Apostolos, secundo Prophetas, tertio Doctores*. Ubi  
 igitur charismata Domini posita sunt, ibi discere oportet veritatem, apud  
 quos est ea quæ est ab Apostolis Ecclesiæ successio. ——— Quemad-  
 modum audiui a quodam Presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui Apostolos  
 viderant, & ab his qui didicerant. ——— *Ibid.* cap. 45.

means

“ means only *Old Men*, not such as had any Office of  
 “ *Teaching* in the Church.

*Ans.* This Gentleman has a particular Talent of  
 wresting the plain Sense of these *ancient Writers*. When  
*Clemens* speaks of *Old Men*, as expressly oppos'd to  
*Young Men*, he then would perswade us, That he  
 speaks of the Order of *Presbyters* in the Church. And  
 now when *Irenaus* speaks of *Presbyters*, such *Presbyters*  
 as had receiv'd the Succession of *Episcopacy*, such *Presbyters*  
 as the Prophet mentions under the Title and Character of  
*Bishops*, then they must be turn'd into meer *Laymen*,  
 and *Irenaus* is suppos'd to appeal to them, not as *Autho-*  
*ritiz'd Teachers*, but only *Old Men*, *Men of good Me-*  
*moires*, and that had liv'd longer than others. But  
 does he think to impose on the Credulity of any ju-  
 dicious Reader, by so gross a Prevarication as this?  
 Can he shew us any Passage in *Irenaus*, where he un-  
 derstands *Presbyters* in this Sense? How comes *St. Ire-*  
*naus* to make all *Old Men* in the Christian Church the  
*Apostles Successors*? And to make it an Instance of the  
 Arrogance of the *Hereticks*, that they thought them-  
 selves wiser not only than the *Apostles*, but than all  
*Old Lay-Christians*, of that and the foregoing Age?  
 And since 'tis the same *Presbyters* he means here, whom  
 he elsewhere ascribes the Succession of *Episcopacy* to, does  
 he not in effect suppose that ancient Writer to confound  
 the Clergy and Laity, and to leave no Distinction be-  
 tween 'em.

His other Shift is as desperate a Subterfuge as that.  
 When *Irenaus* requires 'em, To obey the *Presbyters* in the  
 Church, these (*Presbyters*) that have their Succession from  
 the *Apostles* (as he had shew'd), who with the Succession  
 of *Episcopacy*, have receiv'd the certain Gift of Truth,  
 he pretends, “ That *St. Irenaus* limits the Succession to  
 “ an Order of Men who were more than *Presbyters*;  
 “ and that he distinguishes two sorts of *Presbyters*,  
 “ some who were not, and some who were the Successors  
 “ of the *Apostles*.

*Ans.*

*Ans.* Those whose *Judgments* are prepossess'd in favour of a darling Opinion, are strangely prone to think they can see that in an *Author* that no body else can. That *Irenaus* makes a Distinction between some *Presbyters* that *are*, and *some* that *are not* the *Apostles* Successors, is wholly owing to Mr. Dr——'s Imagination, without any Foundation for it in that ancient Writer. If he make any Distinction at all, 'tis between *Hæretical Presbyters* and *Orthodox* ones, who had *Truth* as well as *Succession* to plead on their side. But 'tis evident, That if we compare this Passage with that other, wherein he applies to *Presbyters* what the Prophet had spoken (as he supposes) concerning *Bishops*, he asserts all *Presbyters* to be *Bishops*, and to succeed one another in the *Episcopacy* or *Episcopal Office*. And makes 'em all *Successors to the Apostles* therein, (*i. e.* with respect to those ordinary Powers of their's, that were derivable to others, and particularly that of Teaching.)

I do not deny, But there was in *Irenaus's* Time, a *Primacy* of Order among these *Presbyters* or *Bishops*, That *One* of 'em had the [*πρῶτος καὶ ἀρχαιότερος*] first Rank and Place, among his *Colleagues* of the same Order and Office. And that is a sufficient Reason for his only mentioning *single Persons*, when he reckons up the *Succession* of the *Bishops* of *Rome*. But the reckoning the *Succession* by such *single Persons*, will never prove 'em to be of a different Office and Order from their *Colleagues*. The *Ἀρχιερεῖς* at *Athens*, were equal in Power, yet *one* of 'em had a greater Dignity than the rest, and therefore was call'd *Ἀρχιερεὺς*, by way of Excellency. And his Name only was set in the publick Records of that Year, and therefore he was call'd *Ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπὶ τῷ ἔτει*, and the Year was reckon'd from him. The like may be observ'd among the *Ephori* and *Bidysai* at *Sparta*. The Number of *Ephori* was always *Five*, from their first Institution by *Lycurgus*. These enjoy'd a Parity of Power between 'em. But among these to give Name to the Year, they made Choice of *one*, who was call'd *Ἐπὶ τῷ ἔτει*,



Ἐπώνυμο here too (as the Ἀρχων at Athens); and him they call'd Πρεσβῆτα τῶν ἐφόρων, as *Plutarch* tells us, "Where (as *Dr. Stillingfleet* well observes, *Irenic.* p. 301.) we have the very Name Πρεσβῆς attributed to him that had only this Primacy of Order, without any Superiority of Power, which is us'd by *Justin Martyr*, concerning the President of Assemblies among the Christians. Now from hence we may evidently see, that meer Succession of some single Persons, nam'd above the rest in the Succession of Apostolical Churches, cannot infer any Superiority of Power in the Persons so named, above others suppos'd to be as Joint-Governors of the Churches with 'em." And were the Succession of such as had the Care of a Parochial Church to be reckon'd up, it would be no wonder if the Rectors only were mention'd, without naming their Assistant-Curates, tho' of the same Order with themselves.

Whether at Rome this first Presbyter had the Name of Bishop appropriated to him in *Irenæus's* Time, I shall not dispute; But I do not see any Probability, that so much as a Distinction of the Names themselves, had obtain'd in the Church of Lyons. For 'tis justly observ'd, that when the Martyrs of the Church of Lyons and Vienna in France, sent *Irenæus* to *Eleutherius*, then Bishop of Rome, they call him their † Brother and Colleague, and tell *Eleutherius*, That if Righteousness could give a due Place and Rank, they shou'd commend to him *Irenæus* among the first, as a Presbyter of the Church, which Degree he had obtain'd. And *Dr. Stillingfleet* justly observes here from *Blondell*, "That *Irenæus* had been then Nine Tears Bishop of Lyons, in the Place of *Pothinus*. And (saith he) *Blondell's* Argument

† Ταῦτά σοι τὰ γεμίματα περὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ κοινῶν εἰρηναίων διακομίσαι. — Εἰ γὰρ ἡδεῖμυ τόπον πρὶ διακισύνην πεποιθῆσαι, ὡς πρεσβύτερον ἐκκλησίας ὑπὲρ ἐσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐν πρώτοις αὖν παρεθέμεθα. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. V. 4.*

“ does

“ does not lie here, That because they call him the  
 “ *Presbyter* of the Church, therefore he was no *Bishop*,  
 “ (as his Antagonist supposes); but he freely acknow-  
 “ ledges him to have succeeded *Pothinus* there in his  
 “ *Bishoprick*. But because after the Difference arose  
 “ elsewhere between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, yet they  
 “ call’d him by the Name of *Presbyter*, it seems very  
 “ improbable, that when they were commending one  
 “ to the *Bishop* of another Church, they shou’d make  
 “ use of the lowest Name of Honour then appropriated  
 “ to *Subject-Presbyters*, which instead of commending,  
 “ were a great debasing of him, if they had look’d on  
 “ a Superior Order above those *Presbyters* as of Divine  
 “ Institution, and thought there had been so great a  
 “ Distance between a *Bishop* and *Subject-Presbyter*, as  
 “ we are made to believe there was. Which is as if  
 “ the Master of a Colledge in one University, shou’d be  
 “ sent by the Fellows of the Society to the Heads of the  
 “ other, and shou’d in his commendatory Letters to ’em  
 “ be styl’d a Senior Fellow of that House. This was the  
 “ Case of *Irenaus*, he is suppos’d to be *Bishop of Lyons*;  
 “ he is sent by the Church of *Lyons*, on a Message to  
 “ the *Bishop of Rome*; when notwithstanding his being  
 “ *Bishop*, they call him *Presbyter* of that Church, when  
 “ there were other *Presbyters* who were not *Bishops*.  
 “ What cou’d any one imagine by the reading of it,  
 “ but that the *Bishop* was nothing else but the Senior-  
 “ *Presbyter*, or one that had a Primacy of Order among  
 “ ’em, but no Divine Right to a Power of Jurisdiction  
 “ over his Fellow-*Presbyters*. See *Irenic.* p. 311, &c.”  
 I may add, That it seems a just Inference from this  
 Letter of the Church of *Lyons*, compar’d with what has  
 been cited from *Irenaus*, That in the Gallick Churches  
 in his Time, the Senior-*Presbyter* was not then distin-  
 guish’d from his Colleagues by the Name of *Bishop*, but  
 both Name and Office were common to him with his Col-  
 leagues. And both were alike according to *Irenaus*, Suc-  
 cessors of the Apostles.

But for the other Thing that Mr. Dr—— was oblig'd to prove in Defence of his Cause, That *Irenæus* appropriates this Privilege of being the *Apostles Successors* to *Diocesan Bishops*, (as distinguish'd from *Parochial Rectors*) he has not so much as made the least Attempt towards it, and I presume will find it too desperate a Task for him to undertake.

Mr. Dr——'s next Witness is St. *Cyprian*, in that noted Place, where speaking of all the *Præpositi*, or all such as preside in the Church, he saith, *They succeed the Apostles by a Vicarious Ordination.*

To this Mr. B. had told him, That *Cyprian* does give the Name of *Præpositi* or *Presidents* to *Presbyters*, as well as *Bishops*. And since he asserts this Succession to the *Apostles* to belong to all such *Presidents*, he must suppose it to belong to *Presbyters* as well as *Bishops*, (i. e. to *Parochial Assistant-Curates* as well as *Rectors*). To this Mr. Dr—— objects, "That this is more than he remembers to have read in him, that *Cyprian* calls *Presbyters* as distinguish'd from *Bishops* *Præpositos*, and that from the whole Design of the Epistle, he must intend only such *Bishops* as he was."

Ans<sup>r</sup>. Since Mr. Dr—— desires to be inform'd, he may look into the 15th Epistle, (a) where he'll find the *Presbyters* as distinguish'd from the *Bishop*, and exercising Acts of Discipline in too imprudent a manner, call'd both *Præpositos* and *Pastores ovium*. He calls them by the same Name, Ep. 4. (b) In the first Section he

(a) He complains in this Epistle, that some *Presbyters* in his Absence admitted the *Lapsi* to Communion, sooner than the Discipline of the Church allowed. He could not indeed so much blame the *Lapsi*, for making all the Haste they could. Sed præpositorum est (says he) præceptum tenere, & vel properantes vel ignorantes instruere, ne qui ovium pastores esse debent, lanii fiant. *Cyp. Ep. 15. p. 193.* Where the *Præpositi* and ovium pastores must signify the *Presbyters* he was blaming before.

(b) Et præpositis & plebi nihil aliud elaborandum est, quam ut disciplina divina præcepta teneamus. Ep. 4. Sect. 1. pag. 174. Cum omnes disciplinam tenere oporteat, multo magis Præpositos & Diaconos curare hoc fas est. *Ibid. Sec. 3.*



calls both the *Bishop* and *Presbyters* as distinguish'd from the *People*, by the Name of *Præpositi*. And in the *third Section*, he mentions the *Præpositi* and the *Diaconi* as concern'd in the Preservation of Discipline. Where if *Bishops* only were intended, all *Presbyters* wou'd be excluded from that Care of Discipline, which even *Deacons* themselves are allow'd. And *Celerinus* in his *Epistle to Lucian*, concerning some Female Relations of his, that had laps'd in the Time of Persecution, tells him, (c) *That the Præpositi having heard their Cause, had commanded 'em to continue as they were, (under a Suspension from the Communion of the Church) till a Bishop be constituted. On which Account he begs Lucian's Intercession for 'em.* Where the *Præpositi* must be understood of the *Presbyters* as distinguish'd from the *Bishop*. Since therefore *Cyprian* asserts all such *Præpositi* or *Presidents* to have succeeded the *Apostles*, he must include *Presbyters*. And 'tis very consistent herewith, that when a *Bishop* had some *Superiority* of Degree in his Age above *Presbyters*, he shou'd reckon *them especially* to have a just Claim to this Priviledge, but not exclusive of that which *Presbyters* had.

And I must add, since I have fully shewn him, that *Cyprian* was no other than a *Parochial Bishop*, 'tis only such *Bishops* that he can be suppos'd to make the *Apostles Successors*. And what Foundation can this lay for those *Diocesan Bishops* claiming such a *Succession* by *Divine Right*, whose Claim is inconsistent with that of *Parochial Bishops* to it?

For *Jerome*, Mr. B. had shew'd him, how plainly he makes *Presbyters* to be the *Apostles Successors*. To which Mr. Dr—— has no other Answer to give, then, "That he grants, *The Presbyters do likewise succeed the Apostles, but not in the Plenitude of their Power.*" But

---

(c) Quorum jam causâ auditâ, præceperunt eas Præpositi tantisper sic esse, donec Episcopus constituatur. — Peto ergo, Domine carissime Luciane, — petitioni meæ annuas, — ut à vobis [confessoribus] auxilium recipiant. Inter Cyp. Ep. 21. p. 202.

as to this I have shewn him, none can *succeed* 'em in the *Plenitude of their Power*, without succeeding 'em in those *Extraordinary Assistances and Gifts* they had; and for the *ordinary Parts* of their *Power*, they never divided 'em, leaving *half* to *one* and *all* the *rest* to another Order of Men.

**I** Come now to Mr. Dr——'s VIth Section; in which he pretends, that Mr. B. argues against a *Succession* to the *Apostolate* from those *Extraordinary Gifts* and *Graces* of the *Apostles*, that cou'd not be communicated.

*Answ.* This is utterly untrue, Mr. B. argues from several *Branches* of *Power* that were the *chief distinguishing Characters* of their *Apostolical Office*, and founded on those *Extraordinary Gifts*, and *incommunicable* to those that *want* 'em.

I have already in the *Remarks* on this Chapter pointed out to him several *Branches* of their *Power*, that were *extraordinary* and *peculiar* to the *Apostles*, and the main *distinctive Characters* of their *Office*, as such.

Mr. B. had to the same purpose produc'd a large Quotation from Dr. Barrow, which I shall now consider what he answers to.

*First*, Dr. Barrow tells us, *To the Apostolical Office it was requisite, they shou'd have an immediate Designation and Commission from God.*

To this Mr. Dr—— answers, " This was not essential to the Apostolical Office, and Instances in *Matthias*, *Barnabas*, *Epaphroditus*, *Titus*, that were *Apostles*, tho' they had not an *immediate Designation* and *Commission*.

*Answ.* *Matthias* was chosen by a *Divine Lot*, and therefore had an *immediate Designation* and *Commission* from God, to whom there was by that *Lot* a solemn Appeal made. How *Barnabas* was constituted an *Apostle* (if he was *one* properly so call'd) the Scriptures do not mention, unless we suppose him first call'd *Acts XIII. 2, 3.* and then his Call was extraordinary, by the particular *Direction of the Spirit of God*. That

*Epaphroditus*

*Epaphroditus*  
Assert  
never  
Sense  
Softbe  
yet w  
St. Pa  
ascribe  
Jesus  
See all  
Seco  
files/sh  
rection  
or by e  
To  
"an i  
Ans  
wou'd  
necessa  
and to  
And th  
cited b  
in a ph  
who wa  
Assertio  
spect to  
other M  
as liv'd  
Acts I.  
ction o  
For wh  
not seen  
Christ w  
And tha  
And tha  
from the  
of these  
that our  
from the

*Epaphroditus* and *Titus* were *Apostles*, is the precarious Assertion of the *Author* without any Proof. *Titus* is never call'd an *Apostle*, nor *Epaphroditus* in the same Sense in which the Twelve were so call'd. *Timothy*, *Sosthenes*, *Sylvanus*, were as much *Apostles* as *Titus*; and yet when he is joyn'd with the *Apostle* in any *Epistles*, *St. Paul* appropriates the Title to himself, and never ascribes it to him. See 2 *Cor. I. 1.* *Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, and Timothy our Brother.* See also, 1 *Cor. I. 1.* *Col. I. 1.*

Secondly, It was requisite (saith *Dr. Barrow*) the *Apostles* shou'd be able to attest concerning our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension, either immediately as the Twelve, or by evident Consequence as *St. Paul*.

To this *Mr. Dr.* replies, "That neither was this an infallible Sign of an *Apostle* as such."

*Answ.* *Dr. Barrow* does not say, That this alone wou'd constitute a Man an *Apostle*; but that this was necessary to qualify a Man for the Apostolical Office, and to distinguish an *Apostle* from ordinary Teachers. And this fully appears from the Passages of Scripture cited by him. And this excludes all those from being in a proper Sense Successors in their Apostolical Office, who want this necessary Qualification. *Mr. Dr.*'s Assertion, That the *Apostle*, 1 *Cor. IX. 1.* — has no respect to those Marks which distinguish an *Apostle* from other Ministers of the Gospel, (if he mean such Ministers as liv'd since that Age) is not only fully confuted by *Acts I. 21, 22.* but carries a very unbecoming Reflection on the Reasoning of the *Apostle* in that Place. For why shou'd he say, *Am I not an Apostle? Have I not seen the Lord Jesus Christ?* If seeing the Lord Jesus Christ were not a necessary Qualification of an *Apostle*? And that is all *Dr. Barrow* there intends to prove by it. And that 'tis such a necessary Qualification, is evident, from the Passage last cited, *Acts I. 21, 22.* — Wherefore of these Men that have accompany'd with us, all the time that our Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the Baptism of John, unto that same Day that he



was taken up from us, must one be ordain'd to be a Witness with us of his Resurrection.

Thirdly, It was needful (saith Dr. Barrow) that an Apostle shou'd be endued with miraculous Gifts and Graces, enabling him both to assure his Authority, and to execute his Office.

To this Mr. Dr—— replies, If this was a distinguishing Mark of the Apostolick Office, then all who had miraculous Gifts and Graces in the Primitive Church, were Apostles.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. The Doctor mentions this only as a Qualification of an Apostle, that distinguishes him from all ordinary Teachers since; Not as that which distinguish'd him from all in the Ages wherein those Gifts continued. Those Gifts were such Credentials of their Authority, as no Teachers can now pretend to, and therefore cannot claim what Mr. Dr—— calls the Plenitude of their Authority.

Fourthly, It was proper to an Apostle (saith Dr. Barrow) that he shou'd be able according to his Discretion, in a certain and conspicuous manner to impart Spiritual Gifts.

To this Mr. Dr—— replies, If this be meant of the extraordinary Gift of Miracles, he had prov'd, they were not Essential to the Apostolical Office.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. That the Gift of Miracles was not peculiar to the Apostles, is true; For how else shou'd they impart it to others, when they never constituted Apostles. But what Dr. Barrow asserts here is, That the Power of imparting those extraordinary Gifts to others, was peculiar to the Apostles. And this Power, I believe, Mr. Dr—— will not find that any others besides the Apostles had. So that it was a proper distinctive Character of their Apostolical Office. And I am sure none can pretend to be their Successors in it.

Fifthly, It was also a Privilege of an Apostle, (saith Dr. Barrow) by vertue of his Commission from Christ, to instruct all Nations in the Doctrine and Law of Christ, &c.

To this Mr. Dr—— replies, That Bishops and Priests succeed 'em in the same Commission, and their Confine

men

ment does not proceed from the Nature of the Priesthood, but Rules of Prudence. For which he refers to his Second Chapter.

*Ans.* And I must refer the Reader to the Answer given there, where I have shewn him, That the Apostles cou'd not, in pursuance of their Commission confine themselves to the stated Care and Government of particular Churches; Whereas Bishops ought to do it, when they take any particular Flock as their Charge. I have also shewn him, That this Confinement is not owing to Compact, but to the Inconsistency of the Care of such a particular Charge, with such an Itinerant Ministry.

Sixthly, Apostles (saith Dr. Barrow) did also govern in an absolute manner, according to Directions, as being guided by infallible Assistance, &c. Whence their Writings pass for inspired, and therefore Canonical.

To this Mr. Dr. — replies, That the Seventy Disciples, St. Luke, St. Stephen, were inspir'd as well as they. And therefore this Inspiration was not Essential to the Apostolical Office.

*Ans.* That either the Seventy Disciples, or St. Luke, or St. Stephen, had such a constant Inspiration as the Apostles, is an unprov'd Assertion. They had no such Promise of the constant unerring Assistance of the Holy Spirit, in delivering the Doctrines and Laws of Christ, as the Apostles had. But this does not hinder their being on some particular Occasions under such an immediate Inspiration. As we grant St. Luke was in Writing his Gospel; and tho' he there in the Preface professes to deliver no more than what he had from the Eye and Ear-witnesses that convers'd with our Lord himself, Luke I. 1, 2, 3. yet in Recording 'em he owns himself instructed from above, *2 Cor.* v. 3. And it was this Promise of the continued unerring Assistance of the Holy Ghost, that gave the Apostolical Preaching and Writings that Authority, that the Discourses and Writings of no ordinary Pastors can have. It was this that empower'd 'em to deliver the positive Institutions of Christ to the Church, and such Rules of Discipline and Practice as are obligatory

to the whole Church. And these important Powers they cou'd no more transmit to any Successors than they cou'd their unerring Assistance on which they were founded. And it was such Powers as these that rais'd 'em so far above any other Officers, and were the main distinctive Characters of their Apostolical Office.

Seventhly, It did belong to them (saith Dr. Barrow) to found Churches, to constitute Pastors, to settle Orders, to correct Offences, to perform all such acts of Sovereign Spiritual Power, in vertue of the same Divine Assistance, according to the Authority the Lord has given 'em for Edification.

To this Mr. Dr—— replies, So does it belong to every Bishop of the Christian Church.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. That every Bishop is under the same Obligation to imploy his Life in founding Churches, and settling Pastors in 'em, as the Apostles were, is not true; Nor do I presume will Mr. Dr—— pretend they are, unless he suppose 'em utterly insensible of their Obligations.

That every Bishop has the same Authority to lay down Orders obligatory to the whole Christian Church, as the Apostles had, is absolutely false. So it is, That every Bishop has the same extensive Power they had, of censuring all Deviations from the Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline they had deliver'd, in what Church soever they found 'em; And that all are equally oblig'd to submit to the Authority of any Bishops now, as they were to that of the Apostles. The Apostles Authority in passing such Censures, neither was, nor cou'd be limited by any human Contracts or Agreements. All Churches equally ow'd a Submission to their Censures, from a just deference to their Apostolical Character and immediate Inspiration. But no Bishop has now any such unlimited Power, nor is the same absolute Submission due to his Censures. Nay, none pretend to it but the Bishops of Rome, that claim it as the pretended Successors of St. Peter; and to what Tyrannical and vile Purposes they have us'd it, all Protestants at least, are sufficiently appriz'd.

So

So the  
peculia  
cessors.  
to fou  
Pastors  
Care,  
Offend  
signific  
vine R  
Or tha  
Paroch  
Plenitu  
Wha  
equally  
he draw  
does no  
For wh  
the inf  
I me  
of Rem  
Successo  
their I  
there w  
Numbe  
asserted  
Mr. Dr  
And ye  
gives u  
have a  
" have  
" moth  
" that  
" Gove  
this sho  
'tis in e  
meant  
we do n  
fix'd be  
nary Pa



So that here is another *Branch* of the *Apostolical Power* peculiar to themselves, and not communicable to any *Successors*. That *Congregational Bishops* have a limited Power to found Churches upon particular Occasions, and settle Pastors in 'em, and to censure Offenders under their own Care, or to joyn with their Brethren in the Censure of an Offending Brother, I shall freely grant him. But what signifies this, either to prove, That *One Man* is by *Divine Right* empower'd to do this for a whole *Diocess*; Or that he is by *Divine Right* (to the Exclusion of all *Parochial Bishops*) a *Successor* to the *Apostles*, in all the Plenitude of their *Ecclesiastical Power*?

What I have said in *Vindication* of *Dr. Barrow*, does equally vindicate *Dr. Lightfoot's Arguments*. For that he draws from casting Lots in the Case of *Matthias*, it does not appear that he had any other *Ordination* at all. For what he alledges as probable to the contrary, from the instance of *St. Paul*, 'tis already answer'd.

I meet with nothing more in this Chapter worthy of Remark. That *Parochial Bishops* are in a larger Sense *Successors* of the *Apostles*, in the ordinary Branches of their Power, mention'd before, I freely grant. That there were *Diocesans* in the Two first Centuries, or any Number of 'em in the Third; Or that the Ancients asserted such *Diocesans* to be the *Apostles Successors*, *Mr. Dr——* has not so much as attempted to prove. And yet that without proving both these, *Mr. Dr——* gives up the Cause, sufficiently appears by what I have already said. For what he saith, "That we have no greater Assurance, That the *Epistles* to *Timothy* and *Titus* were wrote by *St. Paul*, than we have that there were *Bishops* to succeed the *Apostles*, in the Government of the Churches;" I need only give this short Answer, If this be meant of *Diocesan Bishops*, 'tis in effect to give up those *Epistles* as *Spurious*. But if meant of *Congregational Bishops*, 'tis a matter of Fact we do not dispute, provided there be a due Difference fix'd between the *Apostolical Power* and that of ordinary Pastors.

## REMARKS on CHAP. V.

**M**R. B. had objected against Mr. Dr——'s Opinion of the *Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy*, that it has a plain *Tendency to unchurch all the Reformed Churches* that have not that Form of Government, and that this uncharitable Inference from it, has of late been own'd and avow'd by several eager *Defenders* of it. To this Mr. Dr—— replies, "That most of the *Reformed Churches* Abroad have *Bishops*, and that the *Case of those that want Bishops* differs from that of the *Dissenters*."

Before I consider what he saith on these *Two Heads*, I must premise, that all this is nothing to the *Objection*, viz. That his *Principles do unchurch all Reformed Churches* that want the *Diocesan Form of Government*.

For he supposes their *Pastors* to be what he calls *meer Presbyters*; such *meer Presbyters* according to him have no *Power to ordain*, that being by *Divine Right* appropriated to what he calls *Bishops*; those *ordain'd* by 'em, are therefore no better than *Laymen*, and consequently they have no *Authority* to administer the *Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's-Supper*, to *teach or rule* in the Church; and all their *sacred Administrations* are null and void. Nay shou'd they pretend *Necessity* for their wanting *Episcopal Ordination*, this Gentleman has in this very *Book* plainly told us, "That no Man can meddle with sacred Offices, except he be call'd of God and sent. No Man can call or send as from God, but he that is authoriz'd by him for that Purpose. He asserts *Bishops* alone to be so authoriz'd. He tells us, it is the highest *Presumption* to appoint *Ambassadors for Almighty God* without his *Order*, and there is the same Reason for Men's acting in *Christ's House* as his *Ministers* with-

" out

“ out any Commission at all, as to pretend to derive  
 “ a Commission from them who had none themselves.  
 “ And this he extends even to *Cases of Necessity*.” And  
 supposes those he calls *Presbyters*, to have no more  
 Power to ordain than the *People* have : Nay he sup-  
 poses their *laying on Hands* with the *Bishop* (according  
 to the Practice of the *Establish'd Church*) to be a *meer*  
*joining in the outward Ceremony*, without signifying any  
 Thing to the *Conveyance of the Ministerial Authority*.  
 'Tis true, he saith here, p. 92. “ We unchurch 'em not,  
 “ neither is it our Intent to draw any such Conse-  
 “ quence from our Doctrine. If it be Truth, (saith he)  
 “ let all obey it, and take Care they don't oppose it.  
 “ As for those who plead their necessitous Circum-  
 “ stances in their behalf, we judge 'em not, but leave  
 “ 'em to God who judges all Things.” But what can  
 we make more of this, than that tho' his Prin-  
 ciples do by genuine Consequence unchurch 'em, he  
 will not draw that Consequence from 'em himself? And  
 truly he need not, the *Popish Writers* have already  
 drawn this Conclusion against 'em, from the same Pre-  
 mises. The *Dodwell's*, the *Lesley's*, and *Hicks's* of the  
 Age have done it for him; and therefore he (out of  
 his Excess of Charity) will not judge 'em himself, but  
 leaves 'em to the Judgment of God : But this is no more  
 than what Mr. *Dodwell* has done before him, to leave  
 'em to the uncovenanted Mercy of God. And so I pre-  
 sume he'll leave those *Infidels* themselves that never  
 heard of the Christian Religion; and if this be all the  
 Charity he has for 'em, they are little beholden to  
 him for it, and much less to those Principles he defends.  
 But Thanks be to God, the Principles he has advanc'd  
 are as void of Truth, as this natural Consequence drawn  
 from 'em is void of Charity.

I have lately seen a Sermon preach'd by a Reverend  
 Divine of the *Establish'd Church*, at the *Consecration* of  
 the present *Bishop of Cork in Ireland*, wherein he con-  
 siders this Objection against this Doctrine of the Divine  
 Right



Right of the present Episcopacy, and gives these Two Answers to it.

1. " That when a Truth is sufficiently prov'd, such an Objection is no just Prejudice against it.

2. " He denies such a Consequence can be reasonably infer'd from their Doctrine, because a Defect in the Authority or Commission of him that performs a Ministerial Office, will not infer a Nullity in the Performance it self, with respect to the Persons that receive the Benefit of it.

*Ans.* I hope these *Remarks* may convince all unprejudiced Persons, how utterly lame and insufficient the Proof is, even that offer'd in the *Sermon* I refer to, which is wholly founded on Mistakes in Matter of Fact relating to the Primitive Episcopacy. And for the *Latter Answer*, Whatever sorry Relief it may afford the Laity in such *Reform'd Churches* at *Home* or *Abroad*, it affords none to their *Pastors*. For if the Power of Ordination be by Divine Right appropriated to *Diocesan Bishops*, they that never had such Ordination cannot be true *Pastors*; they act without any Commission from God in all their Administrations. They grossly abuse and cheat their People in pretending to such a Commission, and are no better than *Lay-Intruders*. And what greater Reproach can be fix'd on them then this? And how little are they indebted to the Charity of those that maintain such Principles, as must destroy all the Affection and Respect due to 'em, as the authoriz'd Ministers of Christ? And into what miserable Perplexities must the Minds of their People be cast, if they believed such uncharitable Doctrine as this? Methinks so vile and detestable a Consequence, should make all that pretend to Judgment, and Moderation, (as that learned *Author* does) shy of espousing Principles from which it naturally and necessarily follows.

And therefore in Order to vindicate the Reputation of those *Excellent Churches* and their *Pastors*, that are as uncorrupted and pure a Part of the *Catholick Church*, as any to be found on this Side Heaven, I shall

I. Shew

I. Shew, That their wanting the *Diocesan Form of Government*, is not a Matter of *Necessity* but of *Choice*, wherein they act pursuant to their avowed *Principles*.

II. I shall shew, That they have the true *Scriptural and Primitive Episcopacy* among 'em, and consequently, that to *unchurch* 'em on Pretence of their wanting it, argues as gross *Ignorance* as it does gross *Uncharitableness*.

III. I shall suggest something concerning the *Disparity* he pretends between the *Case* of the *Dissenters* and *theirs*. And

IV. Take some Notice of what he has said, to *diminish* the Number of such *Churches* as want *Diocesan Episcopacy*.

I. I shall shew, That their wanting the *Diocesan Form of Church-Government*, is not a Matter of *Necessity* but of *Choice*, wherein they act pursuant to their avowed *Principles*.

And what clearer Demonstration can we have of this, than that their *Confessions of Faith* plainly assert the *Equality* of all *Pastors* and *Teachers* of the Church in point of *Divine Right*, and consequently supposes the *Diocesan Form of Government*, to be an *unnecessary Deviation* from it. And all the World must own, the *Publick Confessions of Faith*, approv'd and sign'd by the *Ministers* of those Churches, to be a truer Standard of their current *Doctrine*, than the private Sentiments of this or that *particular Minister*.

The Protestant Churches Abroad are divided into *Lutheran* and *Reform'd*.

For the *Lutheran Churches*, we have the *Concord of the Lutherans* printed at *Leipsick*, wherein are contain'd the *Confession of Augsburgh*, and the *Apology for the same*, the *Smalcaldick Articles*, *Luther's Greater and Lesser Catechism*. From these *authentick Writings*, 'tis evident, what the Opinion of the *Lutherans* concerning *Episcopacy* is. 'Tis true indeed *Melanchton* yielded something to the *Bishops* in the *Confession of Augsburgh*, and how much he himself was blam'd on that Account, he complains

plains in more Places than one. But it never came into *Melancthon's* thoughts, that a *Bishop* was by *Divine Right* superior to a *Presbyter*, or that the *Power* either of *Jurisdiction*, or of *Order* belong'd to a *Bishop* alone, for he subscrib'd the *Smalcaldick Articles*; but in those *Articles*, that *Pretension* of the *Divine Right* of *Dio-cesan Episcopacy* is wholly overthrown, *Tit. de Pot. & Jurisd. Eccl.*

" The Gospel (say they) gives to those that are set  
" over the Churches, a Command to teach the Gospel,  
" to remit Sins, to administer the Sacraments, and Ju-  
" risdiction also. And by the Confession of all, even  
" our Adversaries, 'tis manifest, That this Power is by  
" *Divine Right* common to all that are set over the Churches,  
" whether they be call'd *Pastors*, or *Presbyters*, or *Bi-*  
" *shops*; and therefore *Jerome, &c.* But one Thing  
" made a Difference afterwards between *Bishops* and  
" *Presbyters*, viz. *Ordination*, because it was order'd,  
" that one *Bishop* shou'd ordain *Ministers* in several  
" Churches. But since *Bishops* and *Pastors* are not dif-  
" ferent Degrees by *Divine Right*, 'tis manifest, that  
" an *Ordination* perform'd by a *Pastor* in his own  
" Church is valid. And afterwards, 'tis manifest, that  
" the common *Jurisdiction* of excommunicating those  
" that are guilty of manifest Crimes, does belong to  
" all *Pastors*.

Let us come to the *Reformed Churches*. In the *Con-*  
*fession* of the Churches of *Helvetia*, 'tis expressly said,  
*Cap. 18.* One and that equal Power and Office is given to  
all *Ministers* in the Church. 'Tis certain from the *Begin-*  
*ning*, *Bishops* or *Presbyters* govern'd the Church with a  
common Care. None set himself above another, or usurp'd  
a larger Power and Dominion over his Fellow-*Bishops*. In  
the mean Time, some one or other call'd together the *As-*  
*sembly* of *Ministers*, and propos'd Matters to be debated  
therein, gather'd the *Opinions* of the rest, and took Care  
to prevent Confusion. This *Confession* was approv'd by  
the *Reformed Churches* of *Scotland*, *France*, *Belgium*,  
*Poland*, *Hungary*, and many in *Germany*.

The



The French Church in their Confession presented to Charles the IXth Art. 30. saith, we believe all true Pastors wherever they are plac'd, to be endued with equal Power, under that only Head, the chief and sole Universal Bishop; and therefore no Church ought to claim an Empire and Domination over any other.

In the Belgick Confession, Artic. 31st, 'tis said, In what Place soever the Ministers of the Word of God are, they have all the same and equal Power and Authority, as being all alike the Ministers of Christ, that only Universal Bishop and Head of the Church.

I need not acquaint Mr. Dr—— That the Confession of Faith now receiv'd in the Establish'd Church of North-Britain speaks the same Language.

And now, can it become any Man of Sense or Modesty, to aver with Confidence, that these Churches are compell'd meerly by the Necessity of their Circumstances to want the Diocesan Form of Church-Government, when their very Confessions of Faith (the publick Standard of their Judgment) so openly declare for the Equality of all Pastors or Ministers in Authority and Power, and deny any Imparity that is founded on Divine Right? And if any particular Divines speak in a different Strain, shall their private Opinion weigh more than the Current Doctrine of the Churches they are Members of, nay, which themselves have subscrib'd? Besides the Testimonies of Dubose and Drelincourt are borrow'd by Mr. Dr—— only from Durell, an Author whose notorious Untruths and Falshoods the learned Mr. Hickman has so fully expos'd in his *Apologia pro eisdem in Anglia Ministris*, &c. and in his *Answer to Mr. Durell and Mr. Scrivener*, that there is no Stress to be laid on his credulous Reports. And I may justly add, That neither of 'em speak one Syllable of the Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy: Nor do the Geneva-Doctors assert any such Thing.

For his Story of *Johannes Antoninus* Bishop of Troyes in the Province of Champagne, that turn'd Protestant, I presume he has borrow'd that too from Mr. Durell.

But

But Mr. *Hickman* has entirely blasted the Credit of it, by the true Account he gives of that Matter from the Author of *Histor. Eccles.* p. 767. Tom. I. " At the End of September, *D. Antonius Caracciolus* Bishop of *Troyes*, " being return'd from the Conference at *Poissy* ( by " which he had profited) and being solicited by some " Princesses and other Lords at Court, appear'd before " the (*Synedrium*) Consistory of the Church of *Troy*, solemnly owning his Errors, and begging to be admitted to the Ministry. Concerning which there " being different Opinions, some thinking he might be " of great Use in drawing over the Papists to the Reformed Party, others ( and not without Ground ) " suspecting the Levity and immodest Life of the Bishop that was but too well known, it was concluded, " they shou'd desire the Judgment of the Ministers " still met at *Poissy*. But they being perplex'd on the " Account of several Circumstances that were then " publish'd, desir'd Advice of the Church of *Geneva*, " whose Opinion is to be found in the *Latin Answer* " of *John Calvin*. In the mean Time *Peter Martyr*, " that great Man pass'd by *Troyes*, in his Return from " *Poissy* to his Church at *Zurick*, by whose Advice the " Bishop having made his *Abjuration*, and sign'd the " *Confession of Faith* [that receiv'd in the *French Reformed Church*] after he had promis'd to desert his " *Episcopal Function*, was admitted to the Ministry, " yet not without Contradiction, for one of the Pastors *Peter Roy* by Name was against it; notwithstanding he having forsaken his *Episcopal Function*, " and accepted a Pension which the *Queen* had order'd " to be given him, preach'd. But he abounded more " in Words than any Thing else, and afterwards behav'd himself very ill: But the Church of *Troyes* " however grew.

And yet from this fabulous Story of Mr. *Durell's*, Mr. Dr ——— infers, " That Mr. B. wrongs the Reformed Churches in saying, they lay under no Necessity of being without Diocesan Bishops, and that " they

" they  
" such  
Where  
man  
Function  
II.  
Dioce  
Scriptu  
The  
Church  
the Pr  
as the  
ment  
by th  
are or  
"Tis  
calls  
Mr. L  
And  
New  
of 'em  
them  
had.)  
" "T  
" gle  
no Pr  
only  
no G  
Bishop  
racter  
And  
Episc  
not o  
ment  
does  
Pret  
ness  
Schi  
Chur

“ they were willing to submit to the Government of  
 “ such Bishops, if they wou’d embrace the Reformation.”  
 Whereas he may see they wou’d not admit this Gentle-  
 man to the *Ministry*, without quitting his *Episcopal*  
*Function*.

II. Tho’ so many of the *Reformed Churches* want the  
*Diocesan Form of Government*, yet they retain both the  
*Scriptural* and the *Primitive Episcopacy*.

They have such *Parochial Bishops* as the *Primitive*  
 Church had, *i. e.* Persons endued with the same *Powers*,  
 the *Primitive Bishops* claim’d, having a particular Church  
 as the *Primitive Bishops* under their Care and Govern-  
 ment; these *Pastors* are as the *Primitive Bishops*, chosen  
 by the *People* whom they take the Oversight of; they  
 are ordain’d, as they, by *neighbouring Parochial Bishops*.  
 ’Tis true indeed, they have not such as Mr. Dr——  
 calls *meer Presbyters* or *Curates* under ’em; nor does  
 Mr. Dr—— pretend that to be essential to a *Bishop*.  
 And indeed we can find no such *meer Presbyters* in the  
*New Testament*. But their *Parochial Bishops* have many  
 of ’em *Coadjutors* or *Assistants* of the same Office with  
 themselves; (as the Church of *Philippi* and *Ephesus*  
 had.) And since Mr. Dr—— himself has told us,  
 “ ’Tis not essential to a Bishop, whether he has only a sin-  
 “ gle Congregation or a Diocess for his Charge,” it can be  
 no Prejudice to their *Episcopal Character*, that they are  
 only the *Pastors* of single Congregations. There is therefore  
 no Ground at all to censure these Churches for wanting  
*Bishops*, unless none but *Diocesans* can claim that Cha-  
 racter (which Mr. Dr—— again and again denies.)  
 And if they retain the true *Scriptural* and *Primitive*  
*Episcopacy*, can it argue any other than gross Ignorance;  
 not only to charge ’em with wanting *Episcopal Govern-*  
*ment*, but to *unchurch* ’em for the want of it? And  
 does not the *Unchurching* of ’em upon so groundless a  
 Pretence, argue the highest Degree of *Uncharitableness*?  
 Can any Principles be more justly branded for  
*Schismatical*, than those that exclude so many *Reformed*  
*Churches* and their *Pastors* out of the *Catholick Church*?  
 Mr. Dr——



Mr. Dr——'s Principles do by necessary Consequence pass this hard Censure upon 'em, whether he draw the Consequence or no. And he himself is not willing to disavow the Consequence, but *leaves 'em to the Judgment of God.* And had they as little Judgment and Charity on the other hand, Might they not retort the Charge with all possible Advantage, against those Churches that are under the *Diocesan Form of Government*? Might they not say, The Power of Ordination was by the *Apostles* committed to *Parochial Bishops.* They only exercis'd it for Two or Three Centuries, in the Christian Church. It was never committed by the *Apostles* to any *Diocesan Bishop* at all, nor was such a Bishop known in the *Primitive Church.* Your Ordinations are therefore null and void, as being perform'd by such as the *Apostles* never entrusted that Power with. And so therefore are all your *Ministerial Performances.* Shou'd any one lay down such Principles as these, and yet pretend, (as Mr. Dr——) "That he does not unchurch these *Diocesan Churches,*" "nor intends to draw any such Consequences from 'em. If they be true, Let all obey 'em, and take care how they oppose 'em. But if they plead the Necessity they were under, to submit to such *Diocesan Ordination,* he will not judge 'em, but leave 'em to God, who judges all things," I wou'd gladly know what Mr. Dr—— wou'd think of such a Man's Charity? And yet I must tell Mr. Dr—— That 'tis certain matter of Fact, that *Diocesans* are not the *Bishops*, whom the *Apostles* left in the Churches, and whom the *Primitive Church* own'd under that Character. And for this I appeal to the Evidence already produc'd, under the Head of *Antiquity.* But a judicious Person can distinguish in the *Diocesan Bishop*, the Power common to him by *Divine Right*, with all other *Pastors*, and that which he owes wholly to that human Constitution, that has modell'd the external Government of the National Church, and made the Ordination by such a *Diocesan*, necessary to all that shall be allow'd to officiate as Ministers in the publick Churches, and enjoy the legal Maintenance annex'd to 'em. And there-

there-  
form  
have  
pass  
Paroc  
Ordin  
to the  
III  
rity M  
ters a  
To  
" fer  
" pac  
" not  
And  
Disser  
that v  
- An  
utterl  
Refor  
Mr. J  
clares  
a sing  
tains,  
Episco  
ters c  
lawfu  
told I  
fer'd  
copacy  
Dioc  
ters (c  
to for  
indee  
Fifth  
some  
dern  
Churc  
for t

therefore we have never declar'd the *Ordinations* perform'd by *Diocesan Bishops* invalid and null, as others have with an *Uncharitableness* equal to their *Ignorance*, pass'd that odious Censure on *Ordinations* perform'd by *Parochial Bishops*. But we must needs say, The latter *Ordinations* appear to us much more conformable, both to the *Scripture*, and to *Primitive Antiquity*.

III. I shall suggest something concerning the *Disparity* Mr. Dr—— pretends, between the *Case* of *Dissenters* and that of other *Reformed Churches*.

To that Purpose he tells us, "There is a great Difference between Condemning and Rejecting *Episcopacy* in general, as *Unlawful* and *Antichristian*, and "not thinking it convenient in some Circumstances." And this he supposes the *Case*, with reference to the *Dissenters at home*, and the *Reformed Churches abroad* that want *Bishops*.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. If Mr. Dr—— mean *Parochial Episcopacy*, 'tis utterly untrue, that either the *Dissenters* or any of the *Reformed Churches*, either censure it, or want it. And Mr. Dr—— himself must own as much, when he declares, That 'tis not *Essential* to a *Bishop*, whether he have a single *Congregation*, or as many as a *Diocese* usually contains, under his Charge. If Mr. Dr—— mean *Diocesan Episcopacy*, 'tis again utterly untrue, That the *Dissenters* condemn and reject all *Diocesan Episcopacy*, as *Unlawful* and *Antichristian*. I have in the former Discourse told him, That their *Divines* at the *Savoy-Conference* offer'd *Archbishop Usher's Model* for the *Reduction* of *Episcopacy*, as the *Ground-work* of *Accommodation*, wherein *Diocesan Episcopacy* is retain'd; only those call'd *Presbyters* (but which were the *Primitive Bishops*) are restor'd to some *Share* in the *Government* of the *Church*: And indeed to far less than what they enjoy'd in the *Fourth*, *Fifth*, and *Sixth Centuries*, after the *Bishop's Church* in some *Places* begun to swell towards the *Bulk* of a *Modern Diocese*. And on the other hand, for the *Reformed Churches abroad*, They are so far from pleading *Necessity*, for their want of *Diocesan Bishops*, that their *Publick*

Con-

*Confessions* plead the Equality of all *Pastors* by *Divine Right*, as the *Foundation* of their *Form of Ecclesiastical Government*. They must therefore pursuant to their own *Principles*, regard the *Diocesan Form* only as an *human Constitution*, and their own as more conformable to the *Holy Scriptures*. And what tho' many of 'em think it a *lawful human Constitution*, which they cou'd if they were in *England* or *Ireland* submit to, what signifies this to the *Claim* of a *Divine Right*? Nay, what celebrated *Writer* of the *Reformed Churches* can Mr. Dr— produce, that ever entertain'd that *Opinion* of the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy*?

Whether our particular *Species* of *Diocesan Episcopacy* be a *lawful human Constitution*, is a quite different *Question*. And as to that, if Mr. Dr— will please to answer Mr. *Baxter's Treatise* concerning it, we shall impartially consider what he has to say in its *Defence*. For I know no *Answer* that *Book* has yet receiv'd, unless a *Book* may be answer'd by a *Man's nibbling* at a few *Passages* in it.

But for the *Reasons* of our *dissent* from the *Establish'd Church*, Mr. Dr— may find 'em at large in Mr. *Baxter's Non-Conformist* stated and argued. And if he'll please to answer that *Book*, or direct us to any *Answer* given to it by any other *Hand*, we shall consider it. And till then he wou'd do better to forbear his *Reflections*. For as Mr. *B.* had shewn him, from the *Transactions* of the *Savoy-Conference*, he is mistaken in thinking, that *Episcopacy in general* was the *Ground* of our *dissent*. *Archbishop Usher's Model* was far from abolishing *Episcopacy*; and yet had that been allow'd, the *Differences* in that *Point* might have been heal'd; And so might our *Differences* in other things, if the imposed *Terms* of *Ministerial* and *Lay-Conformity* (mention'd in the foresaid *Treatise*) had been forborn. And therefore this *Gentleman* talks of our *Differences*, as if he were a *Stranger* to them.



IV. I shall take some Notice of what he has said to lessen the Number of those *Reformed Churches*, that want *Diocesan Episcopacy*.

To that Purpose he tells us, " That the greatest Part of 'em retain *Episcopacy*. That the Churches of *Sweden* and *Denmark* have both the Name and Office of *Bishops*. Those in *Bohemia*, *Poland*, *Hungary*, and several of the *Lutheran Churches* have the Office of *Bishops*, tho' some have chang'd the Name either into *Seniors*, *Superintendents*, *Generales* and *Generalissimi*, who answer to our *Bishops* and *Archbishops*. And therefore, the only Churches in debate, are those of *France*, *Holland*, and *Geneva*, &c.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. Mr. Dr—— who borrows this from Mr. Durell, shou'd have shewn us, that any of those Churches appropriate the same Powers to those whom he calls their *Bishops*, that the *Establish'd Church* does. Else the bare Name of *Bishops* signifies nothing, to prove a Conformity between their Constitution and ours.

For *Denmark*, Mr. Durell tells us, They have *Bishops* and *Archbishops*, both Name and Thing. And Mr. Dr—— saith, They have both the Name and Office of *Bishops*. But I am afraid, if Mr. Dr——'s Principles be true, 'tis impossible they shou'd have any at all. I must therefore desire him to consider Mr. Hickman's Argument, in answer to this Assertion of Mr. Durell. " If (saith he) we consult the History of the Reformation of that Kingdom, about the Year 1537, Bugenbagius is sent for into *Denmark*, where on the 12th of *August*, he perform'd all the Ecclesiastick part of the King's Coronation, and Fourteen Days after he ordain'd Seven *Superintendents*, to be Keepers and Executors of all Ecclesiastical Ordination, and to do the Office of *Bishops*. Now I ask, seeing Bugenbagius was but a *Presbyter*, Whether he put the *Seperintendents* into an higher Order than his own? If he did, who gave him Authority so to do? If he did not, then are there no *Bishops*, properly so call'd in *Denmark*."

Nay, I may argue with Mr. Dr—— Since a *Presbyter*

U

never

never receiv'd any Power, so much as to ordain a *Presbyter*, he cou'd much less have any Power to ordain a *Bishop*. So that by his *Principles*, these *Superintendents* are turn'd into meer *Laymen*, and the *Succession* there depends on an utterly broken *Line*. *Melchior Adam*, who relates this of *Bugenbagius*, also mentions *Luther's* calling Three other *Presbyters* with him in Ordaining one *Nicholas Amsdorf Bishop*. But if *Mr. Dr ———*'s *Principles* be true, such *Lutheran Bishops* must be reputed no better than *Laymen*.

For the Churches of *Poland* and *Hungary*, They approv'd the *Helvetick Confession*, that asserts the Power and Function of all *Ministers* to be one and equal.

For the Church of *Bohemia*, the *Bishops* they had were chosen by the rest of the *Ministers*, the Power of *Excommunication* did not belong to them, but the whole *Synod*; Nay, they were subject to the Judgment of their *Brethren*, and censurable by 'em for *Mal-Administration*. The *Superintendents* in the *Electors of Hanover's* Dominions, are subject to a *Consistory*, (made up of *Ministers* and *Lawyers*) and their *Ministrations* directed and censur'd by 'em. For the *Superintendents* of the *Hessian Churches*, *Zeperus* tells us, " They were to usurp no " *Primacy*, *Superiority*, or *Dominion*, over their Col- " *legues*, or *Brethren*, and claim'd no *Exemption* or " *Immunity* from the common Order, Office, and " *Laws of the Ministry*." So that I scarce know of any of the *Reformed Churches* whom he reckons among the *Episcopal* ones, that have our *Diocesan Form of Government*. And he may see that all of 'em disclaim any *Pretension of a Divine Right* for it.

I shall only add, That *Mr. Dr ———* has forgot the Churches of *Helvetia*, and those renowned ones in the *Valleys of Piedmont*, among those that want the *Diocesan Form of Government*.

For what *Mr. Dr ———* adds in the Fourth Section of this *Chapter*, it contains so little that looks like any *Argument*, that it will only require a few short *Remarks*.

'Tis utterly untrue, (and this *Gentleman* has oft been told so) That we do meerly argue from the *Community of Names* between *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, for the *Office* being the same. We argue from the *Apostle's* only mentioning *Two Officers* in the Church, *Bishops* and *Deacons*, 1 *Tim. III. Tit. I.* from the *Qualifications* of the *Persons* so call'd to 'em, being the same; from *Presbyters* being requir'd to do the *Work of Bishops*; from the utter *Silence* of the *Holy Scriptures* concerning *Two* such distinct *Orders* and *Offices*, (as our first *Reformers* own'd, in the *Papers* before-mention'd.)

Mr. Dr — himself owns, That the *Ancients* distinguish'd the *Clergy* into *Two Orders*. But saith, " They subdivided the *Superior Order* into *Two* others, as the "*Jewish Priests* were divided into *High-Priest* and *Priests*." But I have already shewn him, That *St. Clement*, on whose *Authority* he chiefly relies, never intended any such *Parallel*. I have told him, That *St. Jerome* cou'd intend no such *subdivision* as a *Matter of Divine Right*, without overthrowing his own declar'd *Opinion*, concerning the *Identity* of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* by *Divine Right*. If he pleases to call *Jerome's* positive *Affertions* concerning it, *Rash Expressions*, he may use his *Liberty*. He wou'd perhaps think this great *Arrogance* in any other. But 'tis such *Authors* as he, that wou'd strain such *Expressions* as drop from *St. Jerome* by the by, where he has no *Design* of canvassing the *Question*, against his *declared Opinion*, where he profess'dly treats of it. And if he calls him an *bot Man*, we can tell him of *others*, (such as *Epiphanius*) that express much more *Heat*, but without that clear *Light* that *Jerome* produces, for *Proof* of his *Sentiments*. Nay, I have shewn him, That the *Distinction* between *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, in the *Second*, and generally (at least) in the *Third Century*, wholly related to *Parochial Churches*, and was no greater than that between the *Rector* of a *Parish* and his *Curates*. And there needs no more to shew the *Weakness* of this *Argument*, than to consider, That they as truly subdivided the *Order of Deaconship* into



Two, viz. that of *Deacons* and *Subdeacons*; the latter being as much *subject* to the former, as that of the *Parochial Presbyters* or *Curates*, was to that of the *Parochial Bishops* or *Rectors*. And yet it wou'd be ridiculous thence to infer, that they suppos'd this *Superiority* of the *Deacons* above the *Subdeacons*, to be founded on a *Divine Right*, and *constitutive* of a *distinct Order*. And as they set up an *Archdeacon*, to whom they gave some *Superiority* over the *Deacons*; so they rais'd the *Bishop* of the *chief City* to some *Primacy* and *Superiority* over that of his neighbouring *Parochial Bishops*. And yet Mr. Dr—— himself will not pretend that this was founded on any *Divine Institution*. No more than he will for the Power of *Metropolitans*, *Patriarchs*, and at last the *Papal* itself.

That *Athanasius*, *Eusebius*, *Ruffinus*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, pronounce the Opinion of *Aerius* a *Madness* and an *Herefy*, is what I never heard of before, and shall consider, when Mr. Dr—— is pleas'd to prove it. That *Epiphanius* call'd it so, I shall freely grant; But considering how much *Heat*, and how little *Light*; nay, what palpable *Weakness* and *Ignorance*, (even such as Dr. *Reignolds* observes, the more learned *Popish Patrons* of *Diocesan Episcopacy* are asham'd of) he has shewn in his Attempts to refute the Opinion of *Aerius*, we shall not much regard his *Authority* or *Judgment*, no more than Mr. Dr—— will regard it, when *Epiphanius* so learnedly defends *Praying for the Dead*, and makes the *Rejection* of such *Prayers*, another of the formidable *Heresies* of *Aerius*.

As for Mr. B's *Arguments* from *Scripture*, since this Discourse has overthrown the *Foundation* of all Mr. Dr——'s *Answers* to 'em, they are by this Time in a good Condition to defend themselves. And if they need any farther Defence, it will be now a very easy Task.

Mr. B. had charg'd Mr. Dr—— with advancing an inconsistent Scheme of *Principles*; because he endeavour'd to answer his Arguments on Two inconsistent

Hypo-

Hypo-  
those  
long  
appro  
Schem  
tion  
lippi,  
And  
of E  
him,  
itself,  
fles  
while  
and in  
Digni  
Dioce  
'em,  
to be  
Decea  
to Con  
one of  
such a  
has ab  
Timor  
next C  
For  
be ju  
When  
it. I  
yet le  
He en  
from t  
of any  
ful to  
betwe  
of pru  
the ge  
Mr. L  
the P

*Hypotheses*, and because he sometimes seem'd to grant those Powers of *Excommunication* and *Ordination* to belong to the Office of *Presbyters*, which at other times he appropriated to *Bishops*. He has now indeed made his Scheme more consistent, by rejecting Dr. Hammond's Notion of the *Presbyters* of *Ephesus*, and the *Bishops* of *Philippi*, being *Bishops* in the Sense that he contends for. And he now absolutely excludes *Presbyters* from all Power of *Excommunication* and *Ordination*. But I must tell him, by making his Scheme thus more consistent with itself, he has made it more indefensible. That the *Apostles* were ever the *Bishops* of any particular Churches while they liv'd, is Mr. Dr —'s precarious Assertion, and indeed utterly inconsistent with the Obligations and Dignity of their *Apostolical Office*. That they left any *Diocesan Bishops* as their Successors in the Government of 'em, is utterly untrue in Fact. No such *Bishops* being to be found for Two Hundred or more Years after their Decease. That they committed the Government of 'em to *Congregational Bishops*, is what we contend for. That one of these in the Second or Third Century, claim'd such a Superiority above his Colleagues, as the *Parish-Rector* has above his *Curates*, I freely grant. For the Case of *Timothy* and *Titus*, it shall be further consider'd in the next Chapter.

For his retorting the Charge, by telling Mr. B. That he jumbles and confounds *Independency* and *Presbytery*. When he has said any thing to prove it, I shall consider it. I shall only at present tell him, That Mr. B. never yet learn'd in these Matters *jurare in verba Magistri*. He endeavours to form his Judgment concerning 'em from the Holy Scriptures, and not from the Sentiments of any Party or Denomination whatsoever; but is careful to distinguish in any Form of Church-Government, between what is strictly of *Divine Right*, and what is of prudent human Determination; but conformable to the general Rules of the Holy Scripture. And had Mr. Dr — consulted those Sacred Oracles, without the Prepossessions of a Party, 'tis probable that he

would never have attempted this Task of proving the  
*Divine Right of the present Episcopacy from 'em.*

## REMARKS on his VIth CHAPTER.

HERE Mr. Dr— undertakes to vindicate the  
*Scheme of Principles* that he had laid down. But  
he has offer'd us here such a lame and confus'd Defence  
of 'em, from that particular and full Refutation offer'd  
in Mr. B's *Postscript*, that I might very safely leave the  
Matter to the Reader's Judgment, upon comparing the  
*one* with the *other*.

However, I shall make some few *Remarks* on what I  
meet with in it, that has not been particularly consid-  
er'd in Mr. B's *Postscript*, or in this *Defence* of it.

I. That the *Apostles* have any *Successors* in the *Pleni-  
tude of their Power*; if he thereby understand all the *Spi-  
ritual Powers* that belong'd to 'em, and especially such  
as were the most *distinguishing Marks* of their *Apostolical*  
*Office*, I have already shewn him to be an *Affertion* ma-  
nifestly *false* and *absurd*.

II. For the *ordinary Powers*, viz. those of *Teaching*,  
*Presiding in publick Worship*, *exercising Church-Censures*,  
*Ordination*; he has not offer'd any one solid Proof,  
that the *Apostles* gave to *one Order* of Men the *whole* of  
those Powers, and to *another* only *half*. He himself  
allows the *Presbyters* a Share in the *Government* of the  
Church. Now either he means by it, That they had a  
*Suffrage and Vote* in all *Acts* of Church-Government; Or  
that they only gave *Advice*, without any such *decisive*  
*Vote*. If he mean the *former*, he gives up his *Third Po-  
sition*, which supposes the *Presbyters* to have receiv'd no  
*Governing Power*, but only a *Power of Teaching* and *Ad-  
ministring the Sacraments*. If he mean the *latter*, That  
they can only give *Advice*, then how came the *Scrip-  
tures* to represent the *Elders* as *ruling well*, as well as  
*labouring in Word and Doctrine*? How come the *Elders*

of

of Ep  
1 Pet  
as Te  
being  
Christ  
Ruling  
for A  
ction  
Presby  
Acts  
there  
cbial  
curre  
if he  
Gover  
vernme  
he m  
and i  
for h  
Suffra  
And  
who  
Paroc  
Power  
ancie  
Censu  
when  
II  
the c  
the C  
the A  
An  
Mode  
it to  
Fo  
pag.  
Funct  
the I  
ral t



of *Ephesus* to be requir'd to feed the Flock, *Acts* XX. 28. 1 *Pet.* V. 2. And that *Feeding* implies *Ruling* as well as *Teaching*, is evident, from the Apostolical Authority being represented by *Feeding the Sheep and the Lambs of Christ*, which I hope Mr. Dr—— will own to imply *Ruling* as well as *Teaching* 'em, *John* XXI. 17. And for *Antiquity*, I have shewn him, that after the Distinction between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* first obtain'd, the *Presbyters* of this *Parochial Bishop* had a *Suffrage* in all *Acts* of *Church-Government* as well as he; and were not therefore meer *Councillors* and *Advisers*; for the *Parochial Bishop's* Sentence was as *invalid* without their concurrent *Suffrages*, as *their's* without *his*. And therefore if he wou'd draw any Comparison between our *Civil-Government*, and that ancient *Ecclesiastical Parochial Government*, as he compares the *Bishop* to the *Queen*, so he may compare the *Presbyters* to the *House of Lords*, and if he pleases, the *Laitie* to the *House of Commons*; for he'll find by *St. Cyprian*, that *their Judgment* and *Suffrage* was also requir'd, to the passing of *Censures*. And what signifies all this to the Claim of *Diocesans*, who have put down all these *Parish-Bishops*, and their *Parochial Church-Government*, and engross'd their *ruling Power* into their own hands, and never even admit these *ancient Bishops* to a *Suffrage* in the passing of *Church-Censures*; nay, commit this *Power* to *Lay-Chancellors*, when they have depriv'd these *Primitive Bishops* of it?

III. Mr. Dr—— has given no tolerable *Answer* to the clear *Proof* brought him from *Dr. Stillingfleet*, That the *Government* of the *Christian Church*, was drawn by the *Apostles* from the *Model* of the *Jewish Synagogues*.

And for his *Affertion* of it's being drawn from the *Model* of the *Jewish Temple*, he refers us for the *Proof* of it to a *Passage* in *St. Clement*, and another in *St. Jerome*.

For that of *St. Clement*, I have already shewn him, pag. 42. That *St. Clement* only mentions the several *Functions* of the *High-Priest*, *Priests*, and *Levites*, under the *Law*, to recommend *Order* and *Regularity* in general to the *Church* of *Corinth*. That he never applies

this to *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, in the Christian Church at all. That if he had apply'd it, the *High-Priest* cou'd be no other than the *Parochial Bishop*: But that it no way appears by that *Epistle*, that that Church had any other *Rulers* than its *Presbyters*, the true *Scriptural Bishops*.

For St. *Jerome's* Expressions, they have been already accounted for, p. 188. and I have shewn, that they can never imply the *Divine Right* of a *Parochial Bishop* itself, as an *Order* superior to *Presbyters*, without making St. *Jerome* guilty of a gross *Self-contradiction*. And after all, As no Logician will admit of a valid Argument drawn from bare *Similitudes*, so 'tis the more absurd to found a *Divine Right* upon it. And if such a bare *Similitude* us'd by such an ancient *Writer*, cou'd be suppos'd a solid Foundation of a *Divine Right*, 'tis of such *Parochial Bishops* as the *Diocesan* ones have now depriv'd of it. So that this Argument falls the heaviest on those that make use of it.

To clear this Matter a little further, I wou'd only ask Mr. Dr—— When he contends for the *Jewish Priesthood* being the *Model* of the *Christian*, does he mean, That 'tis the *Model* of the *Government* of the *Catholick Church*, or of a *single Congregation*, (or *Parish-Church*) or of a *Diocesan Church*, or of a *National one*. If it be the *Model* of the *Government* of the *Catholick Church*, then there is none to answer the *High-Priest*, but either our *Saviour* or his pretended *Vicar* the *Bishop of Rome*, who alone claims any *Supremacy* over the *Universal Church*. If it be the *Model* of the *Government* of a *National Church*, then the *Establish'd Church* has no such *High-Priest* at all. There are *Two Archbishops* in *England*, and *Four* in *Ireland*, but none of 'em pretend any *Government* over more than their own *Provinces*. And Mr. Dr—— does not own their *Power* as superior to *Diocesan Bishops*, to be of any *Divine Institution* at all. But for *Bishops*, instead of one *High-Priest*, we have above a *Score* in *England*, and near as many in *Ireland*; and no one of 'em pretends to any *Government* over the

whole

whole  
(in the  
Church  
duce  
Bible  
him,  
chial  
tar for  
making  
Jews.  
Congre  
Bishop  
And  
Diocesan  
Office  
his H  
let h  
it pr  
pleas  
perf  
stand  
tion

IV  
ciples  
Life  
Mr.  
beca  
Comm  
no  
as if  
that  
Apo  
Elim  
wer  
from  
As  
gar

*whole National Church.* If he mean a *Diocesan Church*, (in the modern Sense) as inclusive of all the *Parish-Churches* in one or more *Counties*, Why does he not produce us *one Instance* of any such Church, either in the *Bible* or the *Two first Centuries*? I have already shewn him, that no such can be found. If he mean a *Parochial Church*, or *single Congregation* that has but *one Altar* for all its *Communicants*, besides the Absurdity of making the Government of the *National Church* of the *Jews*, the *Model* of the Government of a *single Christian Congregation*, it wou'd thence follow, that the *Parish Bishop* is the *High Priest*, and his *Curates* the *Priests*. And then he must shew us, by what *Divine Right* the *Diocesan Bishop* deprives so many *Bishops* of their *Office of High-Priests*, and monopolizes their *Power* into his *Hands*, and turns 'em into meer *Priests*. So that let him turn this Similitude which way he pleases, if it prove any Thing at all, it overthrows the Cause he pleads for. And does he expect that so mighty a Superstructure as the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Power* shou'd stand firm, when he builds it on such a *sandy Foundation* as this?

IV. Whether the *Twelve Apostles* and the *Seventy Disciples* were of different Degrees during our Saviour's Life, is a Matter the Cause is no way concern'd in. Mr. B. had shewn him, there is no Probability of it, because there appears no Difference either in their *Commission* or their *Credentials*. To this *Argument* he gives no *Answer*, but appeals to the *Judgment* of the *Fathers*, as if the bare Opinion of Two or Three of 'em, and that founded on an imaginary Supposition of the *Twelve Apostles* being represented by the *Twelve Fountains* of *Elim*, and the *Seventy Disciples* by the *Seventy Palms*, were to be preferr'd before a substantial Reason drawn from their *Commission* and *Credentials* being the same? As if a *mystical fanciful Allusion* were more to be regarded than a *solid Argument*?

V. In



V. In Opposition to Mr. Dr——'s *Three Orders* Mr. B. had told him, that *Christ* instituted the Office of *Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors* and *Teachers* as well as that of *Apostles*, Ep. IV. 11.

To this he answers,

1. " That this Text cannot denote so many Officers in the Christian Church.

To prove this he alledges Two Things ;

The One is, " That if they were so many Officers, they ought to be still continued.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. Now that this Argument is of no Force is hence evident, that there are neither *Apostles* nor *Prophets* to be found in the Christian Church, nor have been many Hundred Years. I have already shewn him, that those *Powers* which were peculiar to the *Apostles*, and the distinctive Characters of their Office, are long since ceas'd, and no Man (unless the *Bishop* of *Rome*) pretends to any of 'em. And for *Prophets* (i. e. Persons that very often preach'd or foretold future Events by an immediate *Afflatus* of the Holy Spirit,) There have been very few Pretenders to this extraordinary Gift for many Ages, and their Pretences have usually met with as little Credit as those of the late *French Prophets*.

The other Argument is, " That the Work of a *Prophet* and *Evangelist* was sometimes done by *Apostles*, sometimes by *Presbyters*.

But this Argument is of no Force at all. Some Works may be common to those whose Offices are distinct. Teaching and Ruling in the Church is the Work of all *Presbyters* ; but it will not thence follow, That because an *Apostle* or a *Prophet* might teach and rule, that there was no Distinction of Office between them and *Presbyters*. If this way of Arguing were good, it would prove, that all *Presbyters* are *Apostles*, and thereby overthrow this Gentleman's Scheme. A *Prophet* was a *Teacher*, but because he frequently taught by an immediate Inspiration, he was more than an Ordinary *Teacher*, and therefore the *Prophets* are distinguish'd from the Teachers

*Teachers in the Church of Antioch, Acts XIII. 1---. The Apostles taught not by an Occasional but constant Inspiration, and had a more extensive Commission, and larger Powers than meer Prophets had. And therefore are distinguish'd always from 'em. And therefore Judas and Silas are distinguish'd by the Character of Prophets from the Apostles whose Epistle they brought, Acts XV. 32, 33. So tho' an Evangelist Work was to teach, it does not thence follow, That every Minister or Teacher was an Evangelist; for an Evangelist's Work was to assist the Apostles in converting the Infidel World and in settling and planting Churches, where a competent Number was converted to the Christian Faith; and it was not consistent with their Office, to undertake the Instruction and Government of a particular Church as their stated Charge.*

2. Mr. Dr—— further answers, “ That these Terms, *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers* do not include so many several Orders or Degrees of *Church Officers*, but rather different *Denominations* conferr'd upon those *Officers* which were in the Church before, with Relation to their *Labours* in several *Parts and Places* in the *Catholick Church*. And therefore he tells us, the *Officers* of the Church when convened at *Jerusalem* upon an extraordinary Occasion, are all compriz'd in these two, *Apostles and Elders, Acts XV. 4.*

*Answ.* It will not follow, That because the *Apostles and Elders* only are mention'd as the *Officers* concern'd in that *Council* at *Jerusalem*, that there were no other *Officers* in the *Christian Church* at all. The *Apostles* themselves were then at *Jerusalem*, and it does not appear, that they had as yet set themselves to the great Work of *converting the Gentiles* to the *Christian Faith*, by travelling *Abroad* for that Purpose. And therefore had not chosen any such *Assistants* in that Work, as were afterwards known under the Name of *Evangelists*. And for *Prophets*, if there had been any in that *Council*, they might be compriz'd under the general Name of

of *Elders*, and yet be distinguish'd from *Ordinary Teachers*, as we actually find them so distinguish'd before, *cb. XIII. 1.* To teach by *Propberick Inspiration*, might therefore be justly reckon'd the distinguishing Character of a higher Order or Degree. That any of the *Presbyters* mention'd in the *New Testament*, were properly *Evangelists*, i. e. such as the *Apostles* chose for their *Assistants* in converting the *Infidel World*, and settling Churches among 'em, Mr. Dr — has no way prov'd. We read of no *Presbyters* or *Bishops*, but what had the *Teaching* and *Ruling* of particular Churches as their *Ordinary Charge*. And therefore this Difference in their Work, was a sufficient Foundation for a Distinction of Order and Degree between *Evangelists* and *Ordinary Pastors*. And yet these *Evangelists* had not the same Powers that the *Apostles* had, no more than they had the same *Credentials*. And since these *Evangelists* founded Churches, and ordain'd *Elders*, 'tis not true, that the founding Churches and ordaining *Elders* was peculiar to the highest Order in the Church; for the *Former* was the ordinary Work of an inferior Order, viz, that of *Evangelists*; the *Latter* belong'd to all *Presbyters*. And even a *Scriptural Bishop* or *Presbyter* might occasionally found a new Church, and join with his *Fellow-Presbyters* or *Bishops* in ordaining others to take the Oversight of it. And Mr. Dr — has given us no manner of Proof to the contrary.

How Mr. Dr — has prov'd that *Presbyters* cannot excommunicate, I must refer to p. 211, &c. where he will find his *Assertion* and the *Grounds* of it clearly refuted.

VI. Mr. Dr — had said, " That the *Apostles* on the Prospect of their own Mortality invested some single Persons in every Church, with a Power to ordain others, and appointed 'em to rule and govern with the same Authority that they had done.

To this Mr. B. had reply'd,

1. That *Presbyters* were invested with the Power of Ordination long before the *Apostles* Decease. This

Mr. Dr —

Mr. D.  
how h

2.

Auth

tion,

or Hu

If

nifies

Episco

Dioce

such

had t

To

" Ap

" mo

" an

" ties

" Ch

" th

" the

" th

" Ap

" Pl

" Pl

" the

" Co

" Fl

" eit

" th

" can

" gle

" wl

" Bi

A

popu

com

there

of C

in C



Mr. Dr—— pretends to have disprov'd in this Book; how he has done so, the Reader may see at p. 240.

2. Mr. B. had propos'd the *Question*, Whether the *Author* mean by every Church, every single Congregation, or every *Diocesan Church* consisting of some Scores or Hundreds of such Congregations.

If he mean the *Former*, his Argument, if true, signifies nothing to prove the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy*; if the *Latter*, he shou'd shew us some such *Diocesan Church*, and prove that the *Apostles* vested such a *Diocesan Bishop* with the same Authority they had themselves.

To this Mr. Dr—— answers, “ That when the  
 “ *Apostles* preach'd the Gospel, they always chose the  
 “ most populous Places of every Country, to labour  
 “ and plant the Faith in, which was ordinarily in Ci-  
 “ ties. Here then they planted and founded their  
 “ Churches, and from hence was the Gospel propagated  
 “ thro' the Country that lay near those Cities, and  
 “ these Countries were in after Ages made Dioceses of  
 “ those Churches. In those Cities it was that the  
 “ *Apostles* ordain'd Elders; for what is call'd in one  
 “ Place *Ordaining Elders in every Church*, is in another  
 “ Place styl'd, *Ordaining Elders in every City*. Where  
 “ the *Apostle* does not mean one Elder in a Place, but a  
 “ Colledge of Presbyters, who might be sent to feed the  
 “ Flock as it increas'd. And over these Presbyters,  
 “ either the *Apostles* themselves did preside, and had  
 “ the Power to govern and ordain'em as they saw Oc-  
 “ casion; or they committed this Power to some sin-  
 “ gle Persons, who might rule, &c. in their stead, and  
 “ who ever since the *Apostles* Times have been call'd  
 “ Bishops.

Ans. I. That the *Apostles* usually chose the most populous Places to labour in, I freely grant, because common Prudence wou'd dictate to'em, that they had there the fairest Prospect of bringing in a large Harvest of Converts. But that they planted Churches only in Cities is not true. St. Clemens has assur'd us the contrary

trary, that they planted Churches in the Country as distinguish'd from Cities and Towns, and plac'd in 'em, not one Bishop with Subject-Presbyters, but Bishops and Deacons, and therefore the true Reason, why what is call'd in one Place *ordaining Elders in every Church*, is call'd elsewhere *ordaining Elders in every City*, is because the Converts of every such City or Town ordinarily made up but one Church or Congregation. And in those Churches the Apostles constituted not a single Bishop but Bishops; as they did at Ephesus and Philippi. So that the Village-Churches planted by 'em, had their Bishops as well as the City ones.

2. That the Apostles during their Life, kept the Power of Governing and Ordaining in such Churches in their own Hands, is no way true. They suppose it to be the Work of those Presbyters, whom they ordain'd in particular Churches to rule well [καλῶς οὐκισαμέναι] and suppose that to be a lower Part of their Office. 1 Tim. V. 17. They require the Presbyter Bishops whom they constituted to feed the Flock, (which implies Ruling as well as Teaching 'em) Acts XX. 28. 1 Pet. V. 2. 3, &c. They ascribe to them the Power of judging those that are within, and of casting notoriously wicked Persons out of their Communion, 1 Cor. V. 2 last Vers. (And this Mr. Dr—— himself reckons among the Powers he appropriates to Bishops.) 'Tis therefore a great Mistake to think, that the Apostles kept the ordinary Government of such Churches as they planted, and in which they ordain'd Presbyters or Bishops, in their own Hands during their Life. For the exercise of that ordinary Government in a particular Church, requires the continual Presence and vigilant Care of it's Pastors, and therefore it cannot be duly manag'd by one that is an itinerant Preacher, and thereby necessitated to an almost perpetual Absence from the Church he is suppos'd to govern, or that can at most only transiently visit it once in several Years. The Apostles understood better the constant Necessity of sacred Discipline to preserve the Purity of the Churches, than to undertake a Task impossible

possible to be duly perform'd by them for those Churches whom they were to leave; some without any Prospect of returning to 'em, others with no Expectation of seeing 'em again for many Years. They were not (as too many have been) fond of engrossing the Name of *Church-Governors*, without doing any Thing answerable to that Character. And therefore wou'd not have the regular Use of Discipline neglected, to monopolize it to themselves. 'Tis true indeed, they had some *superintendency* over those Churches when absent. And therefore cou'd by their *Letters*, deliver any Part of the *Doctrine* and *Laws* of Christ, or any *Rules of Discipline* to 'em, or order any contrary *Disorders* and *Abuses* to be rectify'd and reform'd, and this with an *Authority* peculiar to themselves as *inspir'd Apostles*, and which no *ordinary Church-Governors* did ever claim. And therefore that general *Superintendency* which we ascribe to the *Apostles* over all the Churches, wholly refers to the Exercise of such *extraordinary Powers*, as were not *communicable* by 'em to any *Successors*. But for all *ordinary Acts* of Church-Government, the *Apostles* left these to be perform'd by the *Presbyters* or *Bishops* whom they settled in particular Churches. And for *Ordination*, I have shewn him, that during the *Apostles* Life it was perform'd by *Presbyters* with respect to *Timothy*, and (if we may believe Mr. Dr——) by the *Teachers* of *Antioch*, with respect to the *Apostle* himself. 'Tis also true, That the *Apostles* had some *Presidency* over those *Bishops* or *Presbyters* whom they set over particular Churches. Those *Presbyter-Bishops* were subject to the *Direction* of these *inspired Teachers* as to the *Doctrine* they were to *preach*, and the *Rules of Worship* and *Discipline* they were to *observe*; and they were *censurable* by 'em whenever they deviated from their *Instructions*. But the *Apostles* were so far from depriving 'em of the Power of *ruling* the Churches committed to their Care, that they urge it upon 'em as their necessary Duty.

That



That the *Apostles* committed their *Power* over these *Presbyters*, whom they set over particular Churches, to one *single Person*, is utterly untrue, and contrary to plain Matter of Fact. I have shewn him, That they had several *Powers*, relating to the Churches they planted, and the *Pastors* they set over 'em, founded on their immediate Inspiration, and extraordinary Gifts, which they cou'd no more convey to any Successors, than they cou'd impart those extraordinary Assistances and Gifts. And if we look over the Churches they planted, we find no *single Person* vested with any stated Authority, over the *Presbyters* they had settled. There appears no such *single Person* as a stated Governor over the *Presbyter-Bishops* of *Ephesus*, (For as to *Timothy's* pretended *Episcopal Power*, I shall anon vindicate what Mr. B. had said to overturn that Claim). Nor over the *Bishops* settled with the *Deacons* at *Philippi*. Nor over the *Presbyters* whom *St. Peter* urges to feed the Flock of God. And therefore *St. Jerome* justly makes it the Character of the *Apostolical Age*, That the Churches were then govern'd by the common Council of *Presbyters*. So does *St. Clement*.

I confess, the Custom of one of those *Presbyters* having a *Primacy* of Order, and some *Superiority* above his *Colleagues*, in the Management of the Affairs of the particular Congregation, soon obtain'd in the Christian Church. The Difference being (as I have shewn) in a great measure parallel to that between the *Rector* and the *Curates* of a *Parochial Church*. But this *Superiority* of the *Parish-Bishop* above his *Assistant-Presbyters*, was owing only (as *St. Jerome* assures us) to *Ecclesiastical Custom*, not to *Divine Institution*. And even this is so far from being serviceable to the Cause of *Diocesan Episcopacy*, that (I have shewn) 'tis utterly inconsistent with it.

3. That after the Distinction between the *Congregational Bishop* and his *Presbyters* (like that between the *Parochial Rector* and his *Curates*) obtain'd, the *City Bishops* did in after Ages endeavour to extend their Authority over the Christians of the Country that lay near 'em, and those Countries were (as Mr. Dr—— speaks) made

*Dioceses*

*Dioc*  
*Fact,*  
*Righ*  
*I*  
*if we*  
*grown*  
*to ha*  
*Chur*  
*Paroc*  
*sents*  
*try, a*  
*us, T*  
*Coun*  
*as in*  
*dance*  
*But w*  
*ing C*  
*gregat*  
*dividin*  
*Gover*  
*his M*  
*Church*  
*Comm*  
*vincial*  
*Power*  
*of the*  
*1. Wh*  
*ever t*  
*too nu*  
*Necess*  
*Congreg*  
*first Pa*  
*Or be*  
*Parochi*  
*our Cle*  
*whenever*  
*or Th*  
*that ma*  
*ricks A*

*Dioceses of those Churches*; is indeed true in Matter of Fact, but is so far from being any Evidence of a *Divine Right*, that it affords a strong Argument against it.

I have shewn him, That in the Three First Centuries, if we except *Rome* and *Alexandria*, and a few such overgrown Churches, that began like our overgrown Parishes to have their Chappels of Ease, the generality of the Churches were single Congregations under the Care of a Parochial Pastor and his Assistants. *Justin Martyr* represents the Christians of the Town and neighbouring Country, as making up one Congregation. *St. Clemens* assures us, That where there were Converts enough in the Country, the Apostles constituted Bishops there as well as in the Cities or Towns. And in *Africa* we find abundance of these Bishops planted in more populous Villages. But when the Christians of a City and the neighbouring Country grew too numerous to be confin'd to one Congregation, the City-Bishop did then indeed, instead of dividing his overgrown Parish, keep it all under his own Government, set up inferior Assemblies subordinate to his Mother-Church, like Chappels of Ease to the Parish-Church, still obliging all to communicate at his Altar or Communion-Table. But it was the Metropolitan or Provincial Bishops, that by gradually swallowing up the Power of several Parochial Bishops, first form'd Diocesses of the modern Extent and Size. The Question then is, 1. Whether it be a Matter of *Divine Right*, that wherever the Christian Inhabitants of a Parish grow vastly too numerous to make up one Church, and there is a Necessity of setting up more Congregations, those new Congregations shou'd be only Chappels of Ease to the first Parochial Church, and be committed to meer Curates? Or be made new Parish-Churches, and have their own Parochial Rectors? If this be Matter of *Divine Right*, our Clergy may arraign the Legislature of violating it, whenever they divide any overgrown Parish into Two or Three. And 2. Whether it be of *Divine Right*, that many Scores or Hundreds of such Parochial Bishops shou'd be all swallow'd up, and their Parochial

*Bishops* turn'd into *mean Curates*, to make up one *Dioceſan Church* under the ſole governing Power of one *Dioceſan*, who alone ſhall have Power to *excommunicate* or *ordain* in that large Diſtrict? And if Mr. Dr— will offer us one good *Argument* from either *Scripture* or the *Writers* of the Two or Three *First Centuries*, to prove theſe Two *Assertions*, it ſhall be carefully examin'd.

The Truth is, Theſe Words of Mr. Dr— point us to the true Spring of the *First Deviations* from the *Simplicity* of the *Apoſtolic Age*: Many of the *Epifcopal Churches* planted in the greater *Cities* about the End of the *Third*, and eſpecially in the *Fourth* and *Fifth Age*, became like our *overgrown Pariſhes* with their *Chappels of Eaſe*, ſupplied by the *Curates* that were under the *Parochial Reſtor*, the *Mother-Church* only having an *Altar* or *Communion-Table* at which they all communicated. As theſe *Chappels of Eaſe* and the *Congregations* aſſembling there increas'd, there was a *Liberty* allow'd to the *Curates* to celebrate the *Lord's Supper* in 'em. But all the *Curates* were kept in the like *Subjection* to the *Bishops*, that they were when there was but one *Congregation* under their common *Care*. Nay the *Country* or *Village Bishops* were firſt brought into ſome kind of *Subjection* to the *City* or *Town Biſhop*; and when *Ambition* grew, they were gradually put down, and *Canons* made againſt *conſtituting Bishops* in *Villages* or very *ſmall Towns*, and that for a *Reason* ſuitable to their *Humour* that made 'em, *ne vileſcat nomen Epifcopi*. Nay, The *City* or *Town Bishops* were brought into ſome *Subjection* to the *Biſhop* of the *chief City* in a *Province*, and the *Eccleſiaſtical Government* was gradually caſt into the ſame *Mould* with the *Civil*. And this gave riſe to the Power of *Metropolitans* and *Patriarchs*, and at laſt to that *Claim* of being *Univerſal Biſhop*, which was ſo warmly conteſted between the *Bishops* of the Two *Imperial Cities* of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, till upon the Declenſion of the *Eastern Empire*, the *Roman Biſhop* by a *Thouſand vile Artiſces* erected

the  
But  
whic  
fram  
Dio  
Hiſto  
of th  
thoſe  
reign  
by a  
theſe  
happ  
Prim  
Fo  
ditus  
Apoſt  
had f  
now  
1.  
Epaph  
Word  
an Ap  
ſtincti  
where  
are vir  
2.  
ſle, to  
Chureh  
Care an  
the ne  
3. T  
being a  
gregatio  
we ſho  
Paſtor c  
vine R  
4. T  
nifies in  
to Men



the Fabrick of his *universal Supremacy* and *Monarchy*. But to pretend *God's Authority* for all the *Changes* which were the visible Effects of *humane Ambition*, and stamp a *Jus Divinum* on the Fault of every aspiring *Diotrephes*, wou'd ill become any one vers'd in Church History, and capable to trace there the woful Effects of this *secular Pride* in the *Divisions* and *Corruptions* of those Churches where it most effectually prevail'd and reign'd. It deserves more to be *lamented* than *defended* by any considerate Observer. And the very *First* of these *Changes*, tho' but a small Step to what follow'd, happen'd too late to lay any tolerable Claim to true *Primitive Antiquity*.

For what Mr. Dr—— adds, “Concerning *Epaphroditus* being *Bishop* of *Philippi*, because he is call'd their *Apostle*. I need only in Vindication of what Mr. B. had said in the *Postscript* against what Mr. Dr—— now offers, suggest the following *Particulars*.

1. There is no Manner of Ground to believe, that *Epaphroditus* was an *Apostle* in the proper Sense of that Word. He had neither the necessary *Qualifications* of an *Apostle*, nor the *distinctive Powers* that were the *Distinctive Characters* of the *Apostolical Office*. (See p. 272. where D. Barrow's Characters of the *Apostolical Office* are vindicated from Mr. Dr——'s slender Exceptions.)

2. 'Tis inconsistent with the Obligations of an *Apostle*, to become the *fixed and stated Ruler* of a particular Church, and to make the *Government* of it his ordinary Care and Charge. As I shall shew in the *Remarks* on the next Chapter.

3. There is no Evidence of the Church of *Philippi* being any more than a *single Congregation*. This *Congregation* had it's *Bishops* and *Deacons* already. And if we shou'd suppose *Epaphroditus* constituted the chief Pastor of it, it wou'd signify nothing to prove the *Divine Right* of a *Diocesan Bishop*.

4. 'Tis not true, That the Word *Apostle* never signifies in the New Testament a *Messenger sent from Men to Men*.

Both those Passages Mr. B. had produc'd sufficiently justify the contrary.

For 2 Cor. VIII. 23. Mr. Dr ———'s Objections against the Exposition of that Text are of no Force. For his *First Objection*, viz. "That they are not call'd the Apostles of those Churches whose Alms they carried, but simply Ἐκκλησιῶν of the Churches, i. e. of *their own*, of which they were Bishops, and tho' they did carry the Charity of several Churches, yet they were sent by St. Paul and not by those Churches, Vers. 18, 22.

*Ans.* St. Paul's sending 'em is no way inconsistent with their being sent by the Churches. Thus the Brother whom St. Paul sent with Titus, was chosen of the Churches to travail with their charitable Contributions. And we may much more reasonably suppose the same concerning those other Brethren that are call'd at v. 20. The Apostles, or Messengers of the Churches. And 'tis not probable, that any Churches wou'd unnecessarily send their stated Rulers on such an Errand as wou'd deprive 'em so long of their Labours, when some of the Deacons might be as fitly employ'd in that Service. Nor has Mr. Dr ——— answer'd the Argument offer'd from their being distinguish'd by the Apostle from Titus whom he calls his Partner and Fellow-Helper, whereas this Title most fitly belong'd to 'em, had they been Apostles in the proper Sense of the Word.

For his Second Argument, That they are call'd Apostles before they went to Corinth; and therefore could not be call'd Messengers with respect to the Contributions they brought from thence.

*Ans.* I know of none that suppose 'em call'd Messengers of the Churches, on the Account of the Contributions they brought from Corinth; they are call'd Messengers of the Churches by whom they were chosen to travail with their Alms, and on the Occasion of this Service they were deputed so, and only took Corinth in their way, where they expected some considerable

*Addition*

Add  
with  
F  
sent  
St. L  
A  
that  
and C  
the  
guish  
or M  
For  
the S  
sent  
tis tr  
Apost  
the ge  
and b  
of the  
their  
had o  
them.  
Embass  
bority  
And  
least c  
ticular  
Church  
nifies  
Bishop  
man p  
that th  
prove  
suppor

*Addition to the Contributions* they had already brought with 'em.

For his Third Reason, That one of these Persons sent with *Titus* by *St. Paul* is suppos'd to be either *St. Luke* or *Barnabas*.

*Ans.* Supposing we grant this as a probable Thing, that it might be *St. Luke* or *Barnabas*, or (as *Theodoret* and *Oecumenius* conjecture) *Apollos*, What signifies this to the Argument? For this Brother is as truly distinguish'd from the Brethren that are call'd the *Apostles* or *Messengers of the Churches*, as *Titus* is.

For that other Passage, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Servant is not greater than his Lord, nor he that is sent [Apostle] greater than he that sent him.* Tho' 'tis true that this Passage is applied to *Christ* and his *Apostles*, yet 'tis as evident, that our Lord argues from the general Notion of a *Servant* and *Lord*, a *Messenger* and him that sends him, and from the known inferiority of the *Former* to the *Latter* concludes, that what be their *Lord* whose *Servants* and *Messengers* they were, had condescended to do, wou'd not be unbecoming them. No *Servant* being greater than his *Master*, no *Embassador* or *Messenger* greater than he by whose Authority he is sent.

And yet after all, shou'd we grant him without the least convincing Evidence, that the *Pastors* of any particular Churches, were here call'd *Apostles of those Churches* in the proper Sense of the Word, what signifies this to prove the *Divine Right* of a *Diocesan Bishop*? Or what Shadow of Proof has this Gentleman produc'd to prove, that it was *Diocesan Churches* that they are call'd *Apostles* of? And yet unless he prove this, he does but destroy the Cause he would support.



## REMARKS on his VIIIth CHAPTER.

THIS Chapter is taken up in proving St. James the proper Bishop of Jerusalem.

If our Author would make any Use of this Argument in favour of the *Diocesan Cause*, he must prove that St. James had all the Christians of that City, and the neighbouring Country (making up several Congregations with their distinct Communion-Tables) as his ordinary Charge, appropriating to himself the Powers of (what he calls) Confirmation, Excommunication, and Ordination, and exercising the like Authority over the Bishops or Presbyters set over those several Churches, that *Diocesan Bishops* now exercise and claim as their Right over the Presbyters of their Dioceses.

But to my great Surprise, I do not find that Mr. Dr. makes any Attempt to prove this; but thinks that his being call'd by some of the Ancients Bishop of Jerusalem is sufficient, tho' he has not in all his Book given us one Instance of a *Diocesan Bishop* in all the Three First Centuries. I shall therefore content my self with a few Remarks on his Argument as he proposes it, and the Defence that he makes of it.

1. That St. James was an Apostle is a Matter beyond all Dispute, tho' whether he was one of the Twelve be not so certain, yet Mr. B. has shewn the Affirmative to be much more probable.

2. That St. James took up his ordinary Residence at Jerusalem, is also an utter Uncertainty.

'Tis true, We find him present at the Council of the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren held there, Act. XV. That St. Paul Three Years after his Conversion met him and Peter there, and Fourteen Years after his Conversion found Peter, and James, and John at Jerusalem, is true. But if we shou'd thence conclude, that either St. Peter

or St.  
we sh  
Fact  
conce  
the W  
all, th  
other  
fixed  
Argum  
seems  
to hav  
nary C  
to go  
to pre  
pentan  
ning  
Like  
missio  
making  
do not  
vd 3.  
nary I  
fie to  
takes  
An  
Partic  
1.  
ther  
meron  
We  
Day o  
of the  
that t  
ted to  
into w  
thians  
dea, C  
gypt,  
read,

or St. *John* took that Church for their ordinary Charge, we shou'd draw a false Inference contrary to Matter of Fact; and therefore the bare Silence of the Scriptures concerning St. *James's* travelling into other Parts of the World to propagate the Gospel, is no Argument at all, that he did not herein follow the Example of the other Apostles, but made *Jerusalem* the Place of his fixed Residence. And therefore the Foundation of the Argument it self is but a precarious Supposition. Nay it seems to me, an improbable one, because for an Apostle to have made any particular Church his stated and ordinary Charge, seems not to consist with their Commission to go and teach all Nations, to go into all the World, to preach the Gospel to every Creature, and to preach Repentance and Remission of Sins among all Nations, beginning at *Jerusalem*, [Mat. XXVIII. 19, 20. Mark XVI. Luke XXIV. 47.] How the executing this large Commission could be consistent with any of the Apostles making the Church of *Jerusalem* his ordinary Charge, I do not understand.

3. If we shou'd allow that St. *James* fix'd his ordinary Residence at *Jerusalem*, I see not what it can signify to the Advantage of the Cause Mr. Dr. ——— undertakes the Defence of.

And this will appear if we consider the following Particulars.

1. 'Tis a very uncertain and doubtful Thing, whether the Church of *Jerusalem* consisted of one tho' numerous Congregation, or of several Congregations.

We read indeed of Three Thousand converted on the Day of Pentecost, Acts II. 41. But since that was one of their Anniversary Feasts, 'tis reasonable to suppose, that the far greatest Part of these, were such as resorted to *Jerusalem*, from the several Parts of the World into which the Jews were then dispers'd; such as Parthians, Medes, Elamites, Dwellers in Mesopotamia, Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, &c. Acts II. 9, 10. — 'Tis true, that at v. 5. we read, There were dwelling at *Jerusalem* Jews, devout Men

out of every Nation. But *Kataxistēs* (as Mr. Mede has judiciously observ'd) shou'd be there render'd *Sojourning*, not *Dwelling*. For they cou'd not be at once *Dwellers* at *Jerusalem*, and yet *Dwellers* in *Mesopotamia*, *Judea*, *Cappadocia*, *Pontus*, *Asia*, &c. And *Katōkeniv* is frequently us'd to signify only a *short Abode* or *Stay* in a Place, where the Persons have no *fixed Dwelling*. So that of these Three Thousand Converts, 'tis probable, that very few stay'd long at *Jerusalem*, the most returning to the Places of their former Abode; whither no doubt, they wou'd carry the glad Tidings of the Kingdom of God, which themselves had receiv'd. We read at *Acts* IV. 4. of their Number being increas'd to Five Thousand, (whether the Three Thousand mention'd before, are to be included in that Number, is uncertain). This Company of Believers we find *assembled together*, at v. 23, 31, 32. We read again of *Multitudes of Believers, Men and Women, added to the Lord*, when those converted before were all with one Accord in *Solomon's Porch*, *Acts* V. 12, 13, 14. And again, at *Acts* VI. 2, 5, we read of the whole *Multitude of the Disciples*, being call'd together by the Apostles. And at v. 7. That the *Multitude of Disciples increas'd in Jerusalem greatly*, and many of the Priests became obedient to the Faith. But this great Increase of their Numbers, immediately brought on so great a Persecution against the Church which was at *Jerusalem*, that they were all scatter'd abroad throughout the Regions of *Judea* and *Samaria*, except the Apostles. And this Persecution doubtless reduc'd 'em to a far smaller Number, than many single Congregations are made up of. So that at *Acts* XV. 22. we read of the whole Church at *Jerusalem*, assembled with the Apostles and Elders, and joining with them in the Letter they sent to the Gentile Converts in *Antioch*, *Syria*, and *Cilicia*. We read indeed, That when St. Paul went up to *Jerusalem* at the Feast of Pentecost, *Acts* XXI. St. James and the Elders say to him, Thou seest Brother, how many Thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the Law, &c. What is it therefore, the Multitude must

needs

needs  
Do it  
That  
ordin  
fryal  
other  
fession  
Obser  
no cer  
of the  
rusalem  
sands  
than t  
ble at  
not ex  
shou'd  
on 'em  
rous C  
Divine  
Scores  
Pastor  
us, T  
assum  
munica  
it esse  
to him  
not, f  
the E  
about  
So Ad  
in the  
Apost  
if Mr  
being  
we sha  
Apost  
2. C  
nion,  
severa



needs come together, for they will bear that thou art come, Do therefore this, &c. But this by no means implies, That these many Thousands did all belong to the Church ordinarily residing at Jerusalem; because that Jewish Festival would occasion a great Concourse of Jews from other Parts, and especially of such as with their Profession of Christianity, retain'd a misguided Zeal for the Observances of the Mosaic Law. So that we can make no certain Computation from hence, what the Numbers of those were, that ordinarily made up the Church of Jerusalem; besides, that Church might have several Thousands belonging to it, and yet not be more numerous than the Protestant Church of Paris, that us'd to assemble at Charenton. Now if the Church at Jerusalem did not exceed the Bounds of a single Congregation, if we shou'd grant him, that St. James with the Elders took on 'em the Pastoral Care and Government of that numerous Congregation, what can this signify to prove the Divine Right of a Diocesan Bishop, that deprives many Scores or Hundreds of such Pastors of a great Part of their Pastoral Power? And Mr. Dr—— has no where shewn us, That even in this Church of Jerusalem, St. James assum'd the sole Power either of Confirmation, or Excommunication, or Ordination. And yet Mr. Dr—— makes it essential to a Bishop, that these Powers be appropriated to him. But we have good Reason to believe he did not, since on all Occasions that are mention'd, he allows the Elders their Suffrage and Vote in all Deliberations about Ecclesiastical Affairs. See Acts XV. 2, 4, 22, 23. So Acts XVI. 4. The Decrees of the Council, mention'd in the foregoing Chapter, are said to be ordain'd by the Apostles and Elders. See also, Acts XXI. 18, 20. And if Mr. Dr—— contend for no more than St. James being President or Moderator in this Council of Elders, we shall freely grant it. Such a Presidency was what his Apostolical Character might well allow him to claim.

2. On the other hand, Shou'd we follow their Opinion, who suppose the Church at Jerusalem to consist of several Congregations, that had each their Elders set over 'em,

em, I can as little see what it will signify to the Support of Mr. Dr——'s Cause. For he has not offer'd us the least Shadow of Proof, that St. James appropriated to himself those Powers of Confirmation, Ordination, and Excommunication, which he makes the peculiar and distinctive Characters of Bishops, as a different Order from Presbyters. And yet this is the main Point he shou'd have prov'd, if he wou'd have made any thing of his Argument. But if he consult the Bible, he'll find nothing that he can conclude from thence, but a probable Supposition, That St. James was, while at Jerusalem, the *Præses* or Moderator of that *Confessus Presbyterii*, to whose Care and Government that Church was committed. And that Supposition will do no manner of Service to his Cause, or Disservice to mine.

4. For what Mr. Dr—— affirms of the Country round about, being a Part of St. James's Episcopal Charge, 'tis his own precarious Assertion, for which he has not produc'd the least Evidence.

In all the Passages in the *Acts*, wherein St. James is mention'd, there is not the least Intimation of his being concern'd in the stated Government of any Churches in Judea, distinct from that at Jerusalem. And therefore 'tis only out of his own Head, that Mr. Dr—— furnishes St. James with this imaginary *Dioecesis*. And this Supposition of his, crosses the Grain of true Primitive Antiquity, that assign'd to every Church that had its own Communion-Table in the first Age, its own Bishops; in the second and third Age its own Bishop and Presbyters, (i.e. as I have shewn, its own Rector and Assistant-Curates). So that unless we suppose the Church of Jerusalem to have been singular in the Model of its Government, and different from all other Primitive Churches, we cannot allow any of the neighbouring Churches of Judea, that had their own Communion-Tables, to have been without their own Bishops, or subject to a Bishop that had not his ordinary Residence among 'em. And therefore Dr. Hammond's Hypothesis, (as odd as it seems) is much more plausible than this Gentleman's, who makes

St.

St. James  
Metrop  
which  
is, Ne  
Found  
of a f  
to ma  
presen  
5.  
St. Pe  
being  
To  
I shal  
Mr  
" kin  
" fou  
" Th  
" not  
" shi  
" Im  
" an  
" dir  
" qu  
" be  
" Bi  
" Ap  
" gr  
To  
" do  
" of  
A  
sider  
cann  
To  
thofe  
repli  
this

St. James the Metropolitan over all the Churches of Judaea. But then this will prove the Divine Right of Metropolitans, as a distinct Order from Diocesan Bishops, which Mr. Dr—— very fairly disowns. But the Truth is, Neither the Doctor's Hypothesis nor his, have any Foundation in the Scriptures; and seem only the Result of a strong Imagination, that catches at any Shadows to make out a Conformity between the ancient and the present Model of Church-Government.

5. Mr. B. had alledg'd Dr. Barrow's Reasons against St. Peter's being Bishop of Rome, to disprove St. James's being Bishop of Jerusalem.

To these Mr. Dr—— has offer'd some Reply, which I shall take Notice of.

Mr. B. had from Dr. Barrow shewn, " That the making an Apostle a Bishop of a particular Church, confounded those Offices that God had made distinct; " That the Office of an Apostle and a Bishop, were " not well consistent in their own Nature, the Apostleship being an extraordinary Office, charg'd with the " Instruction and Government of the whole World, " and requiring an answerable Care; Episcopacy an ordinary standing Charge affixed to one Place, and requiring a special Attendance there; That it would " be a Degradation of an Apostle to make him a " Bishop, and that this was wholly needless, since his " Apostleship involv'd all the Power of inferior Degrees, &c.

To the first Reason Mr. Dr—— replies, " That it does not appear from Eph. IV. 11. That the Office of an Apostle and Bishop are distinct.

Ans. That those Offices are distinct, and several considerable Powers belong'd to the former, which the latter cannot claim, I have already fully prov'd at p. 253.

To the Second Reason, from the Inconsistency of those Offices of an Apostle and a Bishop, Mr. Dr—— replies, That the Apostolical Power might be confin'd to this or that District, for the good of the Church.

Ans.



*Ans.* Mr. Dr—— wou'd do well to shew us, How an *Apostle* that confin'd his ordinary Labours to the Government of one particular Church, cou'd execute his Commission of Discipling all Nations, of going into all the World, and preaching the Gospel to every Creature, and of preaching Repentance and Remission of Sins to all Nations. For these seem to me inconsistent and incompatible. And this one Argument renders it very improbable, that St. James fix'd his Residence at Jerusalem, without ever travelling from thence for the Conversion of the Gentiles, and dispers'd Jews. Besides, shou'd we suppose Jerusalem his ordinary Residence, the Conversion of the unbelieving Jews wou'd furnish him with so much Work, as wou'd take up the main of his Time and Labours, and render him incapable of attending the Instruction and Government of a particular Flock; which as Dr. Barrow has observ'd from St. Chrysostom, is a Work difficult and laborious enough to take up a Man's whole Thoughts and Time.

To the Third and Fourth Reasons, From its being a Degradation of an *Apostle*, to make him a *Bishop* of a particular Church, and therefore unlikely, that he who had that superior Charge wou'd undertake an inferior one, Mr. Dr—— replies, " That an *Apostle* and a *Bishop* are the same Thing, and that every *Bishop* has the same Spiritual Jurisdiction the *Apostles* had; and yet, that it wou'd be no Degradation to the King to do the Office of a Lord Mayor, or to the *Bishop* of London to do the Office of a *Vicar*.

*Ans.* That an *Apostle* and a *Bishop* are not different Names for the same Thing, the Reader may see fully prov'd above, p. 253. The former had several Powers which the latter never cou'd claim. Now tho' it wou'd be no Disparagement for a King upon certain particular Occasions to do the Office of a Lord Mayor, or for a Diocesan Bishop occasionally to do the Office of a *Vicar* in Preaching and Baptizing, &c. Yet it wou'd be a Disparagement to a King to make the Work of a Lord Mayor his ordinary Charge. And so wou'd the *Bishop* of London

London  
Works of  
And the  
ment to  
the Go  
and sta  
and ob  
World l

To t  
being a  
his Ap  
Degree.

" Tha  
" Bish  
" same  
" cert  
" Plac

*Ans.*  
the Off  
shew'd  
makes  
every  
cular  
gain r  
easily  
in ord  
any p  
acting  
such a

An  
St. Ja  
lar Ca  
nothin  
can se  
two o  
about  
about  
Chur  
ment

London esteem it an *Indignity*, if he were oblig'd to the *Works* of a *Vicar*, as his *stated Employment* and *Business*. And therefore it wou'd have been as real a *Disparagement* to *St. James's* Apostolical Character, to have made the Government of a particular Church his *ordinary* and *stated Charge*, when his *Commission* both impower'd and oblig'd him to make the *Conversion* of the *Infidel World* his *principal* and *ordinary Work*.

To the Seventh and Eighth *Reasons*, drawn from its being a needless thing to make an *Apostle* a *Bishop*, since his *Apostolical Authority* included that of all *inferior Degrees*, Mr. Dr—— has no other *Reply* to make than, "That it runs upon the Mistake of an *Apostle* and a *Bishop* being two distinct *Offices*, whereas they are the *same*. Only *one* for the sake of Order is fix'd to a certain District, the *other* is always moving from one Place to another to make Converts.

*Ans.* Having before clear'd the Distinction between the Office of an *Apostle* and an *ordinary Pastor*. Having shew'd, That all the *Powers* which Mr. Dr—— makes the *distinctive Characters* of a *Bishop* belong'd to every *Presbyter*, and that the *Apostles* had as such, *peculiar Powers* communicable to no *Successors*, I must again refer the Reader thither. And he may thence easily see, that an *Apostle* needed not be made a *Bishop*, in order to the exercising any Act of Government in any particular Church, and cou'd not without counter-acting his *Commission*, confine his *ordinary Labours* to such a particular Charge.

And for that *Objection* of Mr. Dr——'s, That if *St. James* was not plac'd at *Jerusalem*, to take particular Care of the Church planted there, he wou'd have nothing to do in that City when *Peter* came there; I can see no manner of Force in it: For why might not two or three *Apostles* often meet in that City, to consult about the common Interests of the Christian Religion, about the Propagation of the Gospel, the Planting new Churches, and settling Orders for their future Government. Nay, how usual was it for *Two* of 'em to travel together,

together, in order to the Conversion of the *Infidel World*, and *both* find Work enough to employ 'em.

Mr. B. had said, That the *Fathers* calling St. James *Bishop of Jerusalem*, might be easily accounted for, by their supposing him the *Præses* or *Moderator* of the Council of *Presbyters* there.

To this Mr. Dr — replies, " If by the *Præses* or *Moderator* be meant such an *Ecclesiastical Officer*, as by his Commission had a greater Power than *meer Presbyters* cou'd have by their Commission, then (saith he) he speaks as I wou'd have him; If he means such an Officer who was no more than a *Presbyter*, he is not consistent with himself, who owns that St. James was their *Præses* and an *Apostle*; And he confesses, That an *Apostle* had a Power much superior to any *Presbyter*, &c.

*Ans.* For these *meer Presbyters*, i. e. such as have only the Power of Teaching and Administring the Sacraments, but not that of Ruling the Church by Censures, and Ordaining others; they are such Officers as I cannot find in all the New Testament, and wou'd be glad if any cou'd shew me one of 'em there. But for St. James I have shewn him, That he had by his *Apostolical* Commission, several Powers that no Successor can elaim: So that my granting him such superior Powers as were founded on his *unerring Assistance*, will do Mr. Dr —'s Cause no Service at all, unless he cou'd shew us, That any *Diocesan Bishops* have that *unerring Assistance* and the peculiar Powers founded thereon. But for the ordinary Powers of Confirmation, Excommunication and Ordination, if Mr. Dr — will prove, that these Powers were not common with the *Apostle* to the Elders of *Jerusalem*, but appropriated to himself, and that he alone exercis'd these Powers over several Churches in *Jerusalem* and the Country round about, he will then offer something to the Purpose. But since he has made no Attempt this way, all his Talk of St. James's being *Bishop of Jerusalem* is but an empty Noise, and of the same Strain with what he adds, " Concerning the Apo-

files

" files k  
" Gover  
" sons in  
" had."  
an unpro  
To conc  
to the I  
grant;  
Charact  
is there  
oceed, (c  
Charge)  
such Po  
over all  
this be  
ing call  
must ft  
do no E

And  
the Am  
haps w  
and un  
from E  
He rul  
files, a  
cepting  
XII. 2.  
speaks  
the oth  
Bishops  
cient  
did no  
Nay  
St. Pe  
" the  
" Jol  
" ten  
" the  
Holoru  
BAA



"*fles keeping the Churches they planted under their own Government, till they saw it proper to place single Persons in 'em, to exercise the same Apostolical Power they had.*" Which as I have shewn at p. 302. is not only an unprov'd Assertion, but contrary to Matter of Fact. To conclude, That St. James had an Authority superior to the *New-Testament-Presbyters* as an *Apostle*, I freely grant; That he had any superior Authority under the Character of a *Bishop*, is no way prov'd; And much less is there any Shadow of Proof, that he had a proper *Diocess*, (consisting of many Congregations for his ordinary Charge) and in the Government of it appropriated any such Powers to himself, as *Diocesan Bishops* now claim over all the Churches within their *Diocess*. And till all this be made out, this Argument from St. James's being call'd by some of the Ancients *Bishop of Jerusalem*, must stand for nothing. It may make a Noise, but can do no Execution.

And yet after all, if we examine on what Grounds the Ancients call'd St. James *Bishop of Jerusalem*, perhaps we shall hardly find any Assertion more precarious and ungrounded. What others say of it is borrow'd from *Hegesippus* and *Clemens*. *Hegesippus* saith indeed, He rul'd the Church, *Μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, not after the Apostles, as St. Jerome renders it, (for all the Apostles excepting James the Brother of John, mention'd *Acts XII. 2.* surviv'd him) but with the Apostles. But this speaks him no more the fixed Bishop of Jerusalem than the other Apostles were, who were none of 'em *Topical Bishops* but *Oecumenical Ones*. And accordingly an ancient Author speaking concerning James saith, he did no less than Peter *Ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρίων τοῦ κόσμου ἀνατίθεσθαι*. Nay *Epiphanius* makes him as much Bishop of Rome as St. Peter or St. Paul. For *Clemens*, he saith, "After the Ascension of our Saviour, Peter, James, and John the most honour'd of our Lord, wou'd not contend for the First Degree of Honour, but chose James the Just Bishop of Jerusalem." *Ruffinus* reads it, *Apostolorum Episcopum*. So that it seems his being made Bishop

*Bishop* there, was some Degree of Honour above the rest of the *Apostles*. And therefore the Author of the *Recognitions* that goes under the Name of *Clemens*, tells us, That *James* the Lord's Brother was Prince of *Bishops*, and by his *Episcopal Authority* commanded the *Apostles*. What Pity is it, that these Authors did not make him *Bishop* of *Rome*; for then they had furnish'd the Champions of that Church with a more plausible Pretence for the *Papal Supremacy*. And now wou'd any wise Man lay any Stress upon such ridiculous and palpable Absurdities as these, that advance the *Episcopal Office* above the *Apostolical*? How much more ridiculous is it then to found a *Divine Right* upon 'em? How much more ingenuous is *Valesius* a *Romanist*, who owns that the *Books* from whence *Eusebius* borrow'd this are so full of *Errors*, that there is no Credit due to 'em? Much more shou'd Protestants be asham'd to stake so *High Pretensions* on the Credit of such *fabulous Witnesses* as these.

## REMARKS on the VINTH CHAPTER.

**I** Now come to Mr. Dr——'s Eighth Chapter concerning the (pretended) *Bishopricks* of *Timothy* and *Titus*.

Before I enter on what Mr. Dr—— has offer'd in this Chapter, I must premise, that if Mr. Dr—— wou'd draw any Arguments from *Timothy* and *Titus*, he is oblig'd to prove, that *Timothy* and *Titus* had each a *Diocesan Church* (consisting of several *Congregations* that had their distinct *Communion-Tables*) for their ordinary Charge, and in this *Diocesan Church* appropriated the Powers of *Confirmation*, *Excommunication* and *Ordination* to themselves. How little his tedious Harangue concerning 'em signifies to any such Purpose will appear by a distinct Examination of what he has said.

And

And will b

1.

sus, and ly gra Gover their

prov'd (as I f

2.

“the” “tem

•“was

they v if he

tion, Church

constan porary

mov'd

Not as

for the

gant P

crimes,

any Ce

*Apostle*

bodily

Evange

their

and ser

no mo

which

Agar

prove

Fr

To p

tion of

of one,

And all that is needful to invalidate his Arguments will be contain'd in the following *Remarks*.

1. That *Timothy* and *Titus* were left, the one at *Epheſus*, and the other at *Creet* for a *ſhort Time*, I ſhall freely grant. That they were left there to fix 'em in the *Government* of any particular *Church* or *Churches* as their *ſtated* and *ordinary Charge*, is not only an unprov'd *Aſſertion*, but contrary to plain *Matter of Fact* (as I ſhall ſhew afterwards.)

2. For Mr. Dr——'s *Queſtion*, "In what Capacity they were left, whether as *conſtant Biſhops* or only *temporary Officers* with *Apoſtolical Authority*, which was not to continue?" I have a ſhort *Answer*, That they were left in *neither* of 'em. Not as *Biſhops* at all, if he mean ſuch as appropriate the *Powers* of *Confirmation*, *Excommunication*, and *Ordination* in a *Diocesan Church* to themſelves, for they never did ſo. Not as *conſtant Biſhops*, for they were deſign'd but for a *temporary Abode* in thoſe *Places* from whence they ſoon remov'd, and as far as we learn never return'd to 'em. Not as *Officers* that pretended to *Apoſtolical Authority*, for they were too modeſt to make any ſuch extravagant *Pretenſions*. They cou'd neither deliver the *Doctrines*, nor *Laws* and *Inſtitutions* of *Chriſt*, nor paſs any *Cenſures* on *Delinquents* with the *Authority* of an *Apoſtle*, much leſs cou'd they inflict ſuch *extraordinary bodily Punishments* as they. But they were left there as *Evangelists*, whoſe *Work* was to aſſiſt the *Apoſtles* in their *Labours* to *convert the Infidel World*, and to *plant and ſettle Churches* among 'em. And this *Service* requir'd no more than a *temporary ſhort Abode* in the *Places* to which they were ſent.

Againſt this *Aſſertion* Mr. Dr—— undertakes to prove theſe Two Things.

*Fiſt*, "That they were not *meer Evangelists*."

To prove, this, he fiſt pretends to examine the *No-tion* of an *Evangelist*. Mr. B. had given this *Deſcription* of one, that *he was an itinerant Preacher, whom ſome of*



the Apostles employ'd as his Assistant and Fellow-Labourer in planting and settling of Churches.

Against this Description Mr. Dr—— objects, “ That Priscilla and Aquila are call'd by the Apostle his Fellow-Helpers in Christ, Rom. XVI. 3. And that whatever Aquila might be, Priscilla was no Evangelist.

Ans. If the Apostle had call'd 'em his Fellow-Helpers in the Work of Preaching to Infidel Nations, and planting and settling Churches among 'em; this Argument wou'd have signify'd something to his Purpose. But it will not follow that because all the Evangelists, were the Apostles Fellow-Labourers, all who might on any other Account be his Fellow-Helpers must be Evangelists.

Mr. Dr—— proceeds to give us his Description of an Evangelist, viz. “ That it signifies any one, either Presbyter or Apostle that was sent forth, to preach the Gospel to an unconverted People or Nation, and to baptize 'em upon their believing. So that Preaching and Baptizing was all that belong'd to him as such.” And this he pretends to be Eusebius's Notion of an Evangelist.

Ans. That Eusebius ascrib'd no more Work than this to an Evangelist as such, is utterly untrue, for he not only makes planting the Faith in strange Places by preaching the Gospel, but ordaining other Pastors, and committing to 'em the Cultivation of those whom they brought in, to be a Part of their Office. So that Eusebius's Description of an Evangelist is the same with what Mr. B. had given. See Euseb. Lib. 3. c. 33.

But Mr. Dr—— undertakes to prove, That Excommunication and Ordination did not belong to an Evangelist as such; and since these Powers belong'd to Timothy and Titus, they must be more than meer Evangelists. To this Purpose he tells us, “ That Philip and Timothy are the only two Persons who are call'd Evangelists. For Philip he tells us, we read of his Preaching and Baptizing, but he wou'd not lay on Hands, either for Confirmation or Ordination, but the Apostles were forc'd to send Peter and John to lay on Hands on those new Converts, which had been needless, if Philip had any Commission to perform it.

Ans.

Ans.  
p. 219  
dation  
own;  
14,  
tion or  
any t  
of. Ha  
commu  
(such  
of Mi  
of imp  
that t  
the Po  
wou'd  
with 'e  
such P  
truly  
1 Tim.  
cast sca  
teach a  
for con  
Spirit,  
fore of  
from a  
that th  
ter. T  
whatev  
ers, wh  
Planting  
I have  
the dist  
The  
to prove  
“ Tim  
“ not re  
Ans  
and Or  
continue

*Answ.* If Mr. Dr—— will please to look back to p. 219. of these *Remarks*, he'll find, That all the Foundation of this Argument is a palpable *Mistake* of his own; as if *the laying on of Hands* mention'd *Acts VIII. 14, 15.* was for any such Purpose as either *Confirmation* or *Ordination*. I have there made it evident to any that will not shut their Eyes, that the *laying on of Hands* mention'd in that Place, was in order to the communicating the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit, (such as the Gift of Tongues, of Healing, of Prophecy, of Miracles;) and Timothy and Titus had as little Power of imparting these extraordinary Gifts as Philip. So that this Passage no more proves, that Philip had not the Power of *Excommunication* and *Ordination*, than it would prove that Timothy and Titus were never vested with 'em, since they never laid on their Hands to any such Purpose. But to lay on Hands in Ordination, is as truly ascrib'd to the *Presbytery* as it is to Timothy. 1 Tim. IV. 14. To judge those within the Church, and cast scandalous Offenders out of it, is ascrib'd to all that teach and rule in it. 1 Cor. V. 2 last ver. To lay on Hands for conferring the sanctifying Operations of the Holy Spirit, is ascrib'd to none at all. These Powers therefore of *Excommunication* and *Ordination*, were so far from arguing a Man to be more than an *Evangelist*, that they do not argue him to be more than a *Presbyter*. They were common to all Pastors and Teachers whatever, and much more to all those itinerant Teachers, whom the Apostles employ'd as their Assistants in Planting and settling of Churches. But they were (as I have shewn him) far short of those Powers that were the distinctive Characters of the Apostolical Office.

The Second Thing, That Mr. Dr—— undertakes to prove is, "That that Power and Authority which Timothy and Titus exercis'd at Ephesus and Crete, was not temporary, but to continue in the Church for ever.

*Answ.* If he mean, the Powers of *Excommunication* and *Ordination*, I freely grant him, that they are to continue for ever; and have prov'd, that all Pastors and

Teachers in the Christian Church are vested with 'em. And therefore Mr. Dr—— need not take any Pains to prove, that *Teaching, Admonishing, Rebuking with all Authority, and Ordaining fit Persons* to serve in the Church, are not *temporary Works* but of *perpetual Use*. But for Mr. Dr——'s Argument to prove it, viz. "That whatever *Ecclesiastical Power* Christ invested the Officers of his Church with, was of perpetual Continuance; and that *Timothy and Titus* were *Successors* of the *Apostles* in the *Plenitude of their Power*, and that they must have *Successors* therein." These Three *Propositions* on which 'tis founded, are all of 'em utterly untrue in Fact. *Timothy and Titus* cou'd not deliver the *Doctrines, and Laws, and Institutions* of Christ with the same *Authority* the *Apostles* did, since they had no such *Promise* of the constant unerring *Assistance of the Holy Spirit*. Nor cou'd they claim such a *Submission* to their *Judgment* in those Matters as the *Apostles* might. Nor cou'd they *rectify and reform* all Abuses with the same *Authority* that an *Apostle* cou'd. Much less had they any such *Powers* of *conferring the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, or of delivering Men to Satan for the Destruction of the Flesh*, as the *Apostles* had; and therefore they were far from *succeeding* 'em in the *Plenitude of their Apostolical Power*. And much less did any of the *Parochial Bishops or Presbyters*, that were afterwards settled either at *Ephesus* or in any Part of *Creet*, pretend to derive any such *Plenitude of Apostolical Power* from *Timothy or Titus*. All that they pretended to *succeed* the *Apostles, or Timothy and Titus* in, was in the *ordinary Branches of the Pastoral Office*, (such as *Teaching, being Guides in publick Worship, exercising Church Censures, ordaining others to the same Office*.) And Mr. Dr—— tho' challeng'd thereto [ *Pestscr. p. 133.* ] has not produc'd us the least Proof that any *Bishop of Ephesus*, had such an extensive Commission with respect to other Churches; as *Timothy* had by being an *Evangelist*; or that any *single Bishop*, as the *Successor of Titus*, took the *Island of Creet* for his *Episcopal Charge*, or at the same Time cou'd lay as much Claim

to Da  
did.  
imploy  
Labou  
thro' t  
we can  
natus's  
a Paroc  
Ordina  
suppose  
had un  
Bishop  
any oth  
there.  
they no  
cess?  
just a S  
think  
so man  
Timothy  
Work.  
3. W  
" of ou  
" tempo  
" seem  
" of Ep  
of no  
prove 'e  
'Tis n  
any Pr  
when t  
Apostles  
is no P  
afterwar  
Men wh  
we shou  
low, th  
cerning  
not con



to *Dalmatia* and other Parts as his Province, as *Titus* did. So that *Timothy* and *Titus* as *Evangelists* (i. e. as imploy'd by the Apostles as their Assistants and Fellow-Labourers in the *Planting* and *Settling* of Churches thro' the Infidel World) had in Fact no *Successors* that we can read or hear of. The *Bishop* of *Ephesus* in *Ignatius's* Time, was no more (as I have shewn him) than a *Parochial Pastor* that had a *single Congregation* for his *Ordinary Charge*, which *Timothy* never had, unless we suppose him to have *deserted* his Flock soon after he had undertaken the Care of it. He was no more the *Bishop* of *Ephesus* than of *Philippi*, *Berea*, *Rome*, or any other *Place* where he made as long a Stay as he did there. And if he must have *Successors*, why shou'd they not claim all those distinct Churches for their *Dioceses*? But they had too much Judgment, and too just a Sense of the Weight of the *Pastoral Function*, to think *one Man* capable of making the Government of so many Churches his *ordinary* and *stated Charge*. And *Timothy* himself never undertook any such impossible Work.

3. Whereas Mr. Dr — brings it in as an *Objection* “ of our's, “ That *Timothy* and *Titus* must be only “ *temporary Officers*, because the *Power* of *Ordination* “ seems to be given 'em as exclusive of the *Presbyters* “ of *Ephesus* and *Crete*,” I must tell him, That I know of no one that makes Use of any such Argument to prove 'em *temporary Officers*.

'Tis not probable in Matter of Fact, that there were any *Presbyters* settled either at *Ephesus* or in *Crete*, when those *Epistles* were wrote to 'em. And so the *Apostles* directing *Timothy* and *Titus* to *ordain Elders*, is no Proof that those *Elders* when *ordain'd* cou'd not afterwards *commit the same Doctrine* to other faithful Men which they had receiv'd themselves. And tho' we we shou'd suppose *Elders* there already, it will not follow, that because *Timothy* and *Titus* have *Directions* concerning *Ordination* given 'em, that those *Directions* did not concern the *Elders* as well as *themselves*; or that

those *Elders* settled there were not to concur in such *Ordinations*. For the *ordaining Power* is in the First Epistle to *Timothy*, as plainly ascribed to *Presbyters* as 'tis to *Timothy*. The utmost that can be made of it is, That these *Assistants* of the *Apostles*, who were more fully instructed in the Doctrine of Christianity, than any *New-Converts* could be suppos'd to be, were the fittest Judges of the *Qualifications* of such as were to be ordain'd, and therefore were to have the chief Hand in the Management of *Ordinations*, during their temporary Abode in those Places. But this no way proves, that the *Presbyters* of those Churches were excluded from this Power, when *Timothy* himself had been ordain'd by such. And for Mr. Dr ———'s Challenge, to produce him one *Presbyter* that claim'd this Power before *Aerius*, 'tis fully answer'd at p. 234. and may be retorted with another to produce one *Diocesan* that ever was concern'd in any *Ordination* for Two Hundred Years or more after the *Apostles* Time. But if such *Parochial Bishops* as are now call'd *meer Presbyters* had no Power of *Ordaining*, the Line of *Succession* is utterly broke and lost. And yet these *Parochial Rectors* did not exclude their *Assistant-Curates* from concurring in *Ordination* with 'em.

4. Mr. Dr ——— comes at last to the main Objection against the Pretended *Episcopacy* of *Timothy* and *Titus*, that *Timothy* and *Titus* had no fixed Relation to the Church of *Ephesus*, or that of *Creet* as their ordinary Charge. And

First to begin with *Timothy*.

Mr. B. had told him, That the Scriptures mention no such Thing, as the *Apostles* leaving *Timothy* the fixed and settled Bishop of *Ephesus*.

'Tis no way implied in the *Apostle's* beseeching him to abide still at *Ephesus*, when he went into *Macedonia*, 1 Tim. I. 3. For we read of *Timothy's* abiding at *Berea*, tho' he quickly remov'd thence to *Athens*. Acts XVII. 14, 15 — To this Mr. Dr ——— replies, " That the Word us'd in this last Place is *ἀπαμεινώνω*, which implies their bearing the Brunt, whereas the Word us'd,

1 Tim.

“ 1 *Tim.* I. 3. is *οεσκειναι*, which is seldom or never  
 “ us’d but of a settled or continual Attendance on some  
 “ particular Actions, as 1 *Tim.* V. 5.

*Ans.* If he consult *Lexicons*, they will inform him  
 that *οεσκειναι* signifies a Stay or Abode in any Place,  
 whether temporary or perpetual, long or short. But how  
 comes this Gentleman to take so little Notice of the  
 plain Evidence offer’d him, from St. Paul’s Epistle to him,  
 that the Apostle design’d only a temporary Abode, not  
 a fixed Residence, since he both fixes the Time of it,  
*viz.* till he came to him, 1 *Tim.* IV. 14. And he tells  
 him, that he wou’d come shortly, 1 *Tim.* III. 14. So that he  
 design’d him only for a short Abode and temporary Service  
 there. For in his Second Epistle which was wrote soon  
 after this, he calls him to Rome, 2 *Tim.* IV. 9, 21. and  
 thence carries him with him to the Hebrews, Heb. XIII.  
 23. And Timothy (as Dr. Whitby observes) at the  
 Writing of that Second Epistle was not then at Ephesus,  
 since the Apostle advertises him of his sending Tychicus  
 thither, 2 *Tim.* IV. 12.

Mr. Dr — does indeed take some Notice of this  
 Objection against Timothy’s being constituted Bishop of  
 Ephesus, *viz.* his frequent Removals from Place to Place.

To this he answers “ That tho’ this were true, it  
 “ cou’d not Unbishop him, nor deprive him of that  
 “ Authority over the Church and Clergy, which was  
 “ committed to him by the Apostles. And that the  
 “ true State of the Controversy is not, whether Bi-  
 “ shops were settled in this or that District by Christ  
 “ and his Apostles; but whether there were left in ge-  
 “ neral some particular Persons invested with that Power  
 “ which we call Episcopal, and which no meer Presbyters  
 “ ever justly claim’d ?

*Ans.* If it be granted (as it must be by all that do  
 not shut their Eyes against clear Evidence) that Timo-  
 thy had no more a fixed Relation to the Church of Ephe-  
 sus, than to any of those other Churches which the Apo-  
 stle sent him to visit, all Pretension of his being con-  
 stituted Bishop of Ephesus is overturn’d. And yet this



must be granted by all that consider, that he had no more any *fixed Residence* in that Church, than in any others he went to. For common Reason will dictate, that a *Bishop's ordinary Residence* shou'd be in the Church he undertakes the *stated Care* and *Government* of; otherwise he grossly counter-acts the *Obligations* of his *Office*. Even the *Bishops* of the *Trent-Council* were generally so sensible of this, that it was not without great Difficulty that the Court of *Rome* cou'd divert 'em from declaring *Residence to be of Divine Right*. And even they themselves freely declare, "That the Duties of the Pastoral Office cou'd not be perform'd by such, as instead of watching over their Flocks, do like Mercenaries desert 'em." These Gentlemen therefore little consult the Honour of *Timothy* in making him *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, when if he was so, he must have been almost a perpetual *Non-Resident*. Nay, Since those other Churches had as much Reason to claim him for their *Bishop* in which he resided, as much or more than ever he did at *Ephesus*, he must be a strange kind of *Pluralist* too. But these gross Corruptions had no Place in the Christian Church, while it retain'd any Thing of its Primitive Simplicity; and much less were they found in a Person of *Timothy's* Character. And therefore *Timothy* cou'd be no *Bishop*, unless they will allow him a great Number of *Episcopal Churches*, and those at a very remote Distance to make up his large *scatter'd Diocess*; of which while he attended one, the rest must be neglected.

But Mr. Dr—— has very different Sentiments; for he tells us, "*Timothy's* frequent Removals from Place to Place cou'd not unbishop him, nor deprive him of that Authority he had over the Church and Clergy that was committed to him by the Apostles." But I wou'd gladly know what he means by *Unbishopsing* him; for if he means depriving him of the Spiritual Powers of *Excommunication* and *Ordination*, he need not be concern'd, for they belong'd inseparably to the Office of every *Teacher* in the Church, and much more

thum

to

to these  
Laboure  
" him  
" comm  
" what  
Church,  
or Phil  
tholick  
over th  
Mr. Dr  
Successor  
ed Aut  
Bishop?  
of Eph  
commit  
return,  
ted to h  
'em, a  
Church  
Church  
form'd  
tlemen  
Charge  
a Non-  
cessors  
a Divin  
And  
" Wh  
" by C  
" in g  
" whi  
" ters  
To  
the P  
of exc  
absolv  
the Pa  
have  
invest

to these *itinerant Teachers* that were the *Apostles Fellow-Labourers*. And when he says, "It could not deprive him of his *Authority* over the *Church* and *Clergy* committed to him by the *Apostles*, I would know what *Church* he means." Whether the *Catholick Church*, or such a *particular Church* as that of *Ephesus*, or *Philippi*, or *Corinth*, &c. If he means the *Catholick Church*; if *Timothy* had any such *Authority* over the *Universal Church* and the *Clergy* thereof, let Mr. Dr — acquaint us, who has ever since been his *Successor* in it. If he have *none*, how can his pretended *Authority* prove the *Divine Right* of any *Diocesan Bishop*? If he means such a *particular Church* as that of *Ephesus*, *Philippi*, &c. that was by the *Apostles* committed to him, then the foremention'd *Difficulties* return, which of these *particular Churches* was committed to him, since he perform'd the like *Service* in all of 'em, and since he resided as much in many other *Churches* as in that of *Ephesus*? Or why all those *Churches* in which he resided for some *Time*, and perform'd the same *temporary Service* in order to their *Settlement*, may not equally pretend to be his *Episcopal Charge*? And then these *Gentlemen* must make both a *Non-Resident* and a *Pluralist* of him. And such his *Successors* must be too, if his *Example* be sufficient to build a *Divine Right* upon.

And whereas he tells us, "The Question is not, Whether *Bishops* were settled in this or that *District* by *Christ* and his *Apostles*, but whether there were in general, some *Persons* invested with that *Power* which we call *Episcopal*, and which no *meer Presbyters* ever justly claim'd?"

To this I answer, If by *Episcopal Power* he means, the *Power* of admitting *Men* into the *Christian Church*, of excommunicating notorious and impenitent *Sinners*, and absolving 'em when *Penitent*, and of ordaining others to the *Pastoral Office*, we not only allow some *Persons* to have been invested with it, but affirm all those to be invested with this *Power*, that were made such *Bishops*  
or

or *Presbyters* as are mention'd, *Tim. III.* and *Tit. I.* This Power was conveyed to all those that were appointed *Pastors* and *Teachers* in the Christian Church, being never divided by the *Apostles*, as this Author groundlessly imagines. And therefore for his meer *Presbyters* that had none of these Powers, they are entire Strangers to the *Bible*. 'Tis true that after the *Apostolical* Age, the *Pastors* of particular Churches were distinguish'd under the Name of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* (as *Parochial Pastors* are now into *Rectors* and *Curates*;) and some Superiority allow'd to the former in managing the Affairs of the Congregation; and so those that discharg'd the inferior Office, were subdivided into *Deacons* and *Subdeacons*. But the real Question is, Whether the *Apostles* ever constituted any one Person as the stated or fixed Governor of many Churches, and their several *Pastors*, appropriating to him the Powers of *Excommunication* and *Ordination*; this is what we cou'd never see any Proof for, and yet what Mr. Dr—— shou'd produce some clear Evidence of, if he wou'd defend the *Divine Right* of the present *Episcopacy*. Nay, this Sort of *Episcopacy* I have shewn him to be as great a Stranger to true *Primitive Antiquity*, as 'tis to the *Holy Scriptures*: And such a *Bishop Timothy* never was. And I may add, That if he were the *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, he was no more than a *Congregational Bishop*, unless the Church of *Ephesus* were more numerous in the *Apostles* Time than in *Ignatius's* Days; for I have shewn him from *Ignatius*, that that Church was in his Time only a *Parochial One*.

5. Mr. Dr—— at length undertakes to maintain, that *Timothy* was left at *Ephesus*, and *Titus* at *Crete*, as the fix'd and settled *Bishops* of those Places.

To this Purpose he tells us, "All the Records of the Church give us as ample a Testimony to this Particular, as any reasonable Man can expect for any Matter of Fact; and we may with as much Reason deny, that there were any such *Kings* of *England*, as *William the Conqueror* and *Henry I.* as deny that  
" *Timothy*

" *Tim*  
" *Cree*  
" *Anj*  
the *C*  
*tado's*  
*Holy*  
much  
*uncerta*  
But if  
'tis as  
*sbop* o  
were f  
But I  
terly  
are ca  
cords.  
that  
nor *T*  
*Labou*  
greate  
*Church*  
their  
in *oth*  
than  
Wou'd  
that f  
for a  
after  
in mo  
ceses  
rary  
tion t  
his *L*  
more  
Bu  
" cou  
" Re  
" *A*  
think



" *Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus Bishop of Creet.*

*Answ. Mr. Dr——* must not expect to impose upon the Credulity of Men of Learning by such *Rhodomontado's* as this. I hope he'll allow the *Records* of the Holy Scripture to be as *credible* as any other, and much more credible than the *ambiguous Expressions*, or *uncertain Reports* of particular *Writers* of after Ages. But if those *Records* be true, I will not with him say, 'tis as certain, that *Timothy* was never the *fix'd Bishop* of *Ephesus*, nor *Titus* of *Creet*, as that there ever were such *Kings* as *William the Conqueror*, and *Henry I.* But I may safely say, that the *contrary Assertion* is utterly *improbable*; and few pretended *Matters of Fact* are capable of a fuller *Confutation* from the *sacred Records*. For what can more satisfyingly demonstrate, that *Timothy* was never the *settled Bishop* of *Ephesus*, nor *Titus* of *Creet*, than that by the Account of their *Labours* and *Travels* it appears, that they spent the far greatest Part of their *Time* and *Labours* among *other Churches*; that their *Abode* in *those* was very *short*, their *Service* there quickly *dispatch'd*, and their *Abode* in *other Churches* was of as *long* or *longer Continuance*, than in *those* that are suppos'd to be their *fixed Charge*? Would any Man call him the *fixed Bishop* of *London*, that shou'd only perform the *Episcopal Functions* there for a *Year* or *two*, but who for *Twenty* or *Thirty Years* after is found to perform the same *Episcopal Functions* in most other *Dioceses* of *England*, nay, in many *Dioceses* of *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, &c.? Can such an *itinerary Ministry* as this, consist with a Man's *fixed Relation* to a *particular Church*, which enjoys no more of his *Labours* and *Care* than *Twenty* or *Forty Churches* more?

But saith *Mr. Dr——* " His *Occasional Journies* could no more *Unbishop* him, than such frequent *Removals* and *Journies* would *Unpresbyter* him.

*Answ.* And does he think, That any *Church* wou'd think him their *settled Presbyter*, who had undertaken  
the

the Pastoral Instruction and Conduct of 'em for his *stated Charge*, if he shou'd only officiate a Year or two among 'em, and spend the far greatest Part of his Life in officiating in other Parochial Churches? This wou'd not indeed *nullify* his Office, but it wou'd *blast* his *Character* and *Reputation* with the *Parochial Church*, which he had undertaken the *fixed Charge* of, but so unwarrantably *deserted* to serve *other Churches* that he had *no fixed Relation* to. And no doubt, any *Parish-Church* that he us'd so ill, wou'd discard him from being their *Presbyter*. But such *frequent Removals* were very consistent with the Office of an *itinerant Teacher*, who was to *assist* the *Apostles* in *planting* and *settling* of Churches, and with whose Office and *Work* it was therefore inconsistent to take any one of 'em for his *fixed* and *ordinary Charge*, since he cou'd not do that without *fixing* his *ordinary Residence* among 'em. Whereas his Office oblig'd him to such *frequent Removals*, and that often to *far distant Countries*. And those *Removals* were not as our *Author* calls 'em *Occasional* (i.e. *Accidental* upon some extraordinary Emergencies) but what he must *ordinarily* make to pursue the Ends of his *itinerant* and *unfixed Ministry*.

And therefore Mr. Dr—— has no other *Shift* left than to flee to *Bishop Pearson's Hypothesis*, "*That Timothy was not made Bishop of Ephesus, till after his Travels mention'd in the Acts were over. That the First Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy was wrote in the Year 64, and the Second Epistle Three Years after, and both long after St. Paul's Valedictory Speech to the Elders of Ephesus mention'd Acts XX.*"

In Opposition hereto, Mr. B. had shew'd him from Mr. Owen, that St. Paul left Timothy at Ephesus, and wrote his *First Epistle* to him before his *First Imprisonment* at Rome, and the *Second Epistle* during his *First Bonds* there.

Mr. Dr—— very warily tells us, the only *Question* is, "*Whether Timothy was left at Ephesus before St. Paul call'd the Elders of the Church from thence to Miletus.*"

To

To  
Questi  
was v  
Rome  
son's C  
First  
on it  
oblig  
Mr. O  
Apost  
But  
First  
ders  
with  
ments  
Th  
" Fir  
" Mi  
" ge  
" the  
" to  
" Pro  
" he  
" G  
" pu  
" ce  
" T  
" su  
" of  
" fr  
" th  
" in  
" sn  
" er  
" o  
" p  
" ly  
" b  
" p  
To

To this I might Answer, That this is not the only Question, because if it appear, that the Second Epistle was wrote during the Apostle's First Imprisonment at Rome; it thence evidently follows, that Bishop Pearson's Chronology is wrong, whenever we suppose the First Epistle to be wrote; and so the Argument founded on it is invalidated. And therefore Mr. Dr—— was oblig'd to answer the Arguments Mr. B. had offer'd from Mr. Owen, to prove the Second Epistle wrote during the Apostles First Imprisonment.

But because I take their Account, who suppose the First Epistle wrote before St. Paul's meeting with the Elders of Ephesus at Miletus, to have some Connexion with the other, I shall fairly examine the Two Arguments Mr. Dr—— has offer'd to disprove it.

The First runs thus, " That St. Paul wrote not his  
 " First Epistle before his Meeting with the Elders at  
 " Miletus, will be evident to any one that will dili-  
 " gently read over the XIXth and XXth Chapters of  
 " the Acts of the Apostles. For St. Paul being come  
 " to Ephesus, Acts XIX. 1. and having made Twelve  
 " Prophets by the laying on of his Hands, v. 6. after  
 " he had staid Two whole Years, and had preach'd the  
 " Gospel to all those which dwelt in Asia, v. 10. St. Paul  
 " purpos'd in the Spirit when he had pass'd thro' Ma-  
 " cedonia and Achaia to go to Jerusalem. This is the  
 " Time Mr. Owen supposes Timothy to be left at Ephe-  
 " sus; v. 21. But we may observe 1. That instead  
 " of his being left at Ephesus, he and Erastus were sent  
 " from thence into Macedonia, and we cannot find  
 " that he return'd before St. Paul follow'd him. For  
 " immediately after their Departure, there arose no  
 " small stir about that way. The rest of the Chapter is  
 " entirely spent in shewing the Confusion and Cause  
 " of that Tumult, and by what Discretion it was ap-  
 " peas'd. This Tumult being over, St. Paul immediate-  
 " ly goes into Macedonia, Acts XX. 1. not one Word  
 " being mention'd of Timothy's Return. Nay 'tis im-  
 " possible he shou'd have been in Macedonia and back  
 " again



“ again so soon. Therefore ’tis impossible, that *Timothy* shou’d be left at *Ephesus* at this Time.

*Ans.* The Argument which Mr. Dr — here offers to prove, That *St. Paul* wrote not his *First Epistle* to *Timothy*, before his Meeting with the *Elders* from *Ephesus* at *Miletus*, is so far from being convincing and satisfactory; That ’tis founded on several *Mistakes*, as will appear from the following Account.

*St. Paul* spent at *Ephesus* and in *Asia* Three Years in all. For *Acts* XX. 31. he tells ’em, That for Three Years, he had not ceas’d warning (or instructing) ’em Night and Day. Three Months of that Time he taught in the Jewish Synagogue, *Acts* XIX. 8. Two Years he taught in the School of *Tyrannus*, *Acts* XIX. 9, 10. There remain Nine Months to make up the Three Years. And those make up the Season that *St. Paul* staid in *Asia*, after he had sent *Timothy* and *Eraclus* into *Macedonia*, *Acts* XIX. 22. Most of those Nine Months the Apostle most probably spent in the neighbouring Cities and Towns of *Asia* returning towards the End of ’em to *Ephesus*. ’Tis during this Time of Nine Months that I suppose *Timothy* to go into *Macedonia*, and after the Service he perform’d there, to return to *St. Paul* at *Ephesus*, with whom he was present at the Time of the Tumult and Uproar rais’d by *Demetrius* mention’d in the End of the XIXth Chapter. After the Uproar *Paul* return’d into *Macedonia*, leaving *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, 1 Tim. I. 3. And upon his Arrival in *Macedonia* he wrote that First Epistle to him, wherein he tells him, That he hoped to come to him shortly. But changing his Purpose of returning to *Ephesus*, he sent to *Timothy* to come to him in *Macedonia*, whither *Timothy* came and join’d with the Apostle in his Second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, 2 Cor. I. 1. which was sent to ’em from *Philippi* by *Titus* and *Lucas*. From thence he went into *Greece* staying there Three Months, and particularly from *Corinth* wrote his Epistle to the *Romans*. From *Greece* he purpos’d to sail into *Syria*, but understanding that the Jews lay in wait for him, he return’d into

into Ma  
sent bef  
Timothy  
came to  
stay we  
nions t  
fail d to  
he sent

Then  
pos’d, t  
Account  
going to  
those I  
his hav  
The oth  
nia soo  
lity in  
lence o  
Objecti  
Fact th  
inform

But  
such as  
History  
of sac  
upon t

I. T  
Epistle  
Elders  
purpos  
fore or  
ing, &  
at Mil  
see his  
with d  
other  
we su  
Revel  
with

into Macedonia, and coming thither from Philippi, he sent before him Seven Companions of his Travels, of whom Timothy was one, ordering 'em to stay at Troas till he came to 'em. Thither he came, and after Seven Days stay went on Foot to Assos, where his other Companions that went by Sea took him in, with whom he sail'd to Mitylene, Trogyllium, and so to Miletus, where he sent to Ephesus for the Elders of the Church.

There are in this Account Two Matters of Fact suppos'd, that are not mention'd by St. Luke in his brief Account of St. Paul's Travels; the one is, Timothy's going to Macedonia, and returning from thence during those Nine Months that the Apostle staid in Asia, after his having sent Timothy and Erastus into Macedonia. The other is, Timothy's Return to St. Paul in Macedonia soon after the Uproar. But as there is no impossibility in either of these Matters of Fact, so the bare Silence of St. Luke concerning 'em, can be no reasonable Objection against 'em, there being many other Matters of Fact that are omitted by him, which St. Paul's Epistles inform us of.

But that these are not meer Precarious Suppositions, but such as are founded upon solid Grounds from the sacred History, and such as must be allow'd to render that Part of sacred Chronology consistent with it self, will appear upon the following Reasons.

I. There is this plain Evidence, That St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy was wrote before his Meeting with the Elders at Miletus, that in that Epistle, St. Paul did then purpose to return shortly to Timothy at Ephesus, and therefore orders him till he came to give Attendance to Reading, &c. But in his Speech to the Elders from Ephesus at Miletus, he plainly tells 'em, that he knew, they should see his Face no more, which Declaration of his fill'd 'em with so much Sorrow, v. 38. — This he cou'd know no otherwise than by Divine Revelation. So that unless we suppose him mistaken in what he pretended Divine Revelation for (and such a Supposition will not consist with the Reverence due to the positive Affeclaration of

of an *inspired Apostle*; ) we must allow these Words to be spoken after the writing of that *Epistle*, wherein he expresses his *Intention* and *Hope* of coming to Timothy at Ephesus. And there is no such dangerous Consequence to be drawn from the *Apostle's* being disappointed in what he only *intended*. For we often read of his being diverted from executing what he had *purpos'd* by the immediate Direction of the Spirit of God. Thus we read at *Acts XVI. 6, 7*. That when Paul and Silas had gone thro' Phrygia and the Region of Galatia, they were then forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the Word in Asia; and after they were come to Mysia, they assay'd to go into Bythynia, but the Spirit suffer'd 'em not, St. Paul might therefore be disappointed in his Purpose of returning to Timothy at Ephesus after the Uproar rais'd there, without any Reflexion on his *Apostolical Inspiration*. But the Credit of that must greatly sink, if we shou'd suppose him mistaken in a *Prediction* that he utters with such a solemn *Asseveration*, as that *Acts XX. 25*. So that we must allow this Matter of *Fact*, that the *Epistle* was wrote before that *Meeting*, unless we make the *Apostle* to be mistaken in what he delivers as a *Prophe-tical Prediction*. And there is no other way of clearing the Truth of it, but the *Matter of Fact* here suppos'd, viz. Timothy's returning back to Ephesus during the last Nine Months St. Paul spent in Asia, and most probably near the Expiration of 'em.

2. That St. Paul wrote his *Second Epistle* to Timothy during his first Imprisonment at Rome, is clearly prov'd from the many Arguments produc'd from Mr. Owen to which Mr. Dr ——— has offer'd no Reply. And on that Supposition of the *Second Epistle* being wrote during his first Bonds, this Matter of *Fact* I lay down must be allow'd true. For the *Apostle* wrote that *Epistle* to him when he went into Macedonia. But he never went into Macedonia, in the Time between his *Meeting with the Elders* at Miletus and his first Imprisonment; for he went from Miletus directly to Jerusalem, whence he was sent Prisoner to Casarea; and after Two Years Abode in Ca-

stody

stody  
cedom  
nia in  
cond  
Rome  
Journ  
Timot  
there  
so ret  
joinin  
from  
so to  
3.  
the w  
consist  
We  
St. Pa  
From  
salem  
going  
gain  
from  
(For i  
as he  
prison  
Three  
sent T  
comin  
thithe  
relati  
Philipp  
sar. 11  
Ephesi  
Timoth  
other  
one of  
ingly  
Uproar  
joins v  
stody



study there, was sent to *Rome*, and came not near *Macedonia* all that Time. So that his going into *Macedonia* must be before this Meeting at *Miletus*; if his *Second Epistle* was wrote during his *First Imprisonment* at *Rome*. And there is no other Time to allot for his Journey from *Ephesus* thither, but *after the Uproar*. And *Timothy* must have been with him, and have been left there when that *Tumult* happen'd. And must have also returned to him in *Macedonia*, both in order to his joining with him in his *Second Epistle* to the *Corinthians* from *Philippi*, and coming back with him to *Troas*, and so to *Miletus*.

3. These Two Suppositions I have laid down, render the whole of this Part of *sacred Chronology* clear and consistent.

We may observe from *Acts XVIII. v. 19.* That *St. Paul, A. D. 55.* came first from *Corinth* to *Ephesus*. From thence he sail'd to *Casarea*, and went up to *Jerusalem*, and thence went down to *Antioch*, and thence going over the Regions of *Galatia* and *Phrygia* came again to *Ephesus*, *Acts XIX. i.* and from thence (not from *Rome*) wrote his *First Epistle* to the *Galatians*. (For in that *Epistle* he makes no mention of his Bonds, as he does in all the other *Epistles* wrote during his Imprisonments). This was *A. D. 56.* At *Ephesus* he stay'd Three Years. In the last Year of his Abode there, he sent *Timothy* and *Erastus* into *Macedonia*; and upon the coming of *Stephanus*, *Fortimatus* and *Achaicus* to him thither, he wrote this *First Epistle* to the *Corinthians* relating to the Schism rais'd in that Church, not from *Philippi* (as the Postscript mentions) but from *Ephesus*. As appears from *1 Cor. XVI. 8. I will abide at Ephesus till Pentecost.* And there he supposes that *Timothy* would pay 'em a short Visit, and would with other Brethren hasten his Return to him at *Ephesus*, or one of the neighbouring Cities. See *v. 10, 11.* Accordingly I suppose *Timothy* to return to him before the Uproar happen'd. And in that *Epistle* only *Sosthenes* joins with him. And in the same *Epistle*, he declares

his Intentions to come to 'em when he pass'd thro' Macedonia, 1 Cor. XVI. 5. Accordingly the Uproar oblig'd him to leave Ephesus (probably somewhat sooner than he had intended.) From Ephesus where he left Timothy, 1 Ep. I. 3. he came to Troas in his Way to Macedonia, where he made some stay, and finding not Titus there, he had no rest in his Spirit, but went thence into Macedonia. After some considerable Time spent in visiting those Churches, Timothy came to him from Ephesus before his passing into Greece, mention'd Acts XX. 2. And accordingly joins with him in the Second Epistle he wrote to the Corinthians from Philippi by Titus and Lucas. For St. Paul met with Titus in Macedonia, by whom he was greatly comforted in the good Account he had brought him concerning the Church of Corinth, 2 Cor. VII. 5, 13, 14 v. Thus we see, how these several Passages illustrate one another, and confirm the Truth of both those Suppositions I have made, and (what is very material) every way consist with the Truth of the Apostle's Prediction, That he shou'd see the Faces of the Elders of Ephesus no more.

And by this Account also, it appears, that Timothy was so far from being the settled Bishop of Ephesus, that his Abode there was but very short, perhaps not of much longer Continuance, than his Abode at Berea, from whence he so soon remov'd to Athens. And since after this First Epistle, the Apostle leaves the Government of the Church of Ephesus, to the Care of the Elders that met him at Miletus, all Pretensions of Timothy's settled Government over 'em as their Bishop, is overturn'd. For as to the Second Epistle, 'tis most probable, that Timothy was not at Ephesus when it was wrote to him. (As I have shewn from Dr. Whitby.)

I might here add, That besides the many Arguments call'dg'd from Mr. Owen to prove, that the Second Epistle to Timothy was wrote during St. Paul's first Bonds at Rome, which (as I have shewn) necessarily suppose it to be wrote before his Meeting with the Ephesine Elders at Miletus, I might inforce some of 'em, and sub-

join

join o  
I shal  
I.  
makes  
but on  
pos'd  
to Tim  
to Bon  
of the  
be Par  
the Po  
of his  
Timoth  
like T  
Prisone  
counte  
Impriso  
and ne  
ment,  
in his  
own'd

2. T  
that I  
Timoth  
of his  
logy) b  
tho' he  
had del  
deliver  
to the C  
expecte  
Epistle  
Timothy  
come to  
pians, P  
and his  
'em, Ph  
in his P  
to prepa

join *others* that confirm the Truth of this Hypothesis. I shall only suggest these.

1. 'Tis observable, That in *St Paul's first Epistle* he makes no mention at all of his being then a Prisoner, but on the contrary was at *Liberty*, and therefore purpos'd to return to *Ephesus*. But in the *Second Epistle* to *Timothy*, he speaks of his *suffering Trouble*, even *unto Bonds*, and therefore exhorts *Timothy* not to be *asham'd* of the *Testimony* of our Lord, nor of him his Prisoner, but to be *Partaker* of the *Afflictions* of the Gospel according to the *Power* of God, 2 Tim. II. 9. I. 8. He here speaks of his *Bonds* as a new *Trial*, under which he exhorts *Timothy* (who most probably had not yet met with the like Treatment) not to be *asham'd* of him the Lord's Prisoner, or the Cause he suffer'd for; this is easily accounted for, if we suppose this to be the *Apostle's first Imprisonment* at Rome. But the *Caution* appears strange and needless, if this was the *Apostle's Second Imprisonment*, since *Timothy* had been already his *Fellow-Sufferer* in his *First Bonds*, and had already with all Courage own'd him and his Cause under those Sufferings.

2. Tho' the *Apostle* was not actually releas'd from that Imprisonment mention'd in his *Second Epistle* to *Timothy* when he wrote it, yet he had a certain Prospect of his Release. He mentions his *First Answer* (or *Apolo-gy*) before *Nero*, and intimates his *Acquittal* thereon, tho' he was not yet discharg'd. He tells us, *That God had deliver'd him from the Mouth of the Lion, and wou'd deliver him from every evil Work, that he might yet preach to the Gentiles*, 2 Tim. IV. 16, 17, 18. And as he then expected *Timothy's* speedy coming to him, so in his *Epistle* to the *Hebrews* wrote after this, he mentions *Timothy's* being set at *Liberty*, with whom he intended to come to 'em, Heb. XIII. 23. And in his *Epistle* to the *Philippians*, he mentions his Design of sending *Timothy* to 'em, and his Trust in the Lord that he himself shou'd shortly see 'em, Phil. II. 19, 24. The same Confidence he expresses in his *Epistle* to *Philemon*, and accordingly orders him to prepare him a Lodging, Ep. Phil. v. 22. Now this



can no way agree to his *Second Imprisonment*, in which he had no such *Prospect of Deliverance*, from which he never was releas'd, but actually *suffer'd Death* as a Martyr for the Cause of Christ. Let any impartial Reader then judge, how utterly improbable it is, that this *Epistle* shou'd be wrote in his *Second Imprisonment at Rome*.

I now come to Mr. Dr——'s *Second Argument* against St. Paul's writing his *First Epistle to Timothy*, before his *Meeting with the Elders at Miletus*.

" That he did not (saith he) will be evident, if we  
 " observe St. Paul acquaints the *Elders* which were at  
 " *Ephesus*, after they were come to *Miletus*, of what  
 " shou'd happen to 'em hereafter, and therefore warns 'em  
 " to Care and *Watchfulness*. For he addressees himself  
 " to 'em in the Future Tense. *I know this, that after*  
 " *my Departure, shall grievous Wolves enter in among you,*  
 " *not sparing the Flock, also of your own selves shall*  
 " *Men arise speaking perverse Things, to draw Disciples*  
 " *after 'em.* But in the *First Epistle to Timothy*, which  
 " according to Mr. Owen and Mr. B. was wrote *some*  
 " *Time before* this Charge was given at *Miletus*, those  
 " very Things which he told the *Ephesians* wou'd come  
 " to pass, had *happen'd* before he wrote the *Epistle*,  
 " which cou'd not be, if it had been written before  
 " the *Meeting at Miletus*. Thus St. Paul assigns this  
 " as the chief End of his leaving *Timothy at Ephesus*,  
 " namely, *to charge some that they taught no other Do-*  
 " *ctrine, &c. because some having swerv'd from the Truth,*  
 " *were turn'd aside to vain Jangling, &c.*

*Ans.* There is no solid Ground at all to suppose that those mention'd 1 Tim. I. 3, 6. as teaching other Doctrine, swerving from the Truth, and turning aside to vain jangling, are the grievous Wolves that shou'd tear the Flock, mention'd in his Charge to the Elders at Miletus, or the Men among themselves that shou'd speak perverse Things to draw Disciples after 'em. Those whom the Apostle mentions, 1 Tim. I. 3, 4, 5, &c. seem'd to be *Judaizing Christians*, that wou'd mix the Ob-

servance

servan  
grievou  
were  
and P  
turn t  
and p  
most p  
Timoth  
Christi  
of Ep  
Galati  
to pre  
And t  
may  
Apostl  
when  
least I  
having  
Caution  
which  
Second  
the Er  
they  
whom  
therefo  
tion'd  
Ephesu  
wrote  
Mr. D  
thesis.

He  
" turn  
produc  
be fou  
Mr.  
" Tim  
" Fir  
" pro  
" to f

servance of the *Mosaick Law* with *Christianity*. The *grievous Wolves* that *shou'd tear the Flock*, *Acts XX. 29.* were most probably either *open Enemies* to *Christianity* and *Persecutors* of it, or such *Hereticks* as wou'd overturn the essential Principles of the *Christian Religion*, and persecute those that adher'd to 'em. Nay, 'tis most probable, that the *Apostle* in that *First Epistle* to *Timothy*, does not suppose this *Error* of the *Judaizing Christians* to have actually spread much in that *Church* of *Ephesus*, but rather in *other Churches*, (as in that of *Galatia*, *Colosse*, &c.) and therefore cautions *Timothy* to prevent their being diffus'd into that of *Ephesus*. And that it had not actually spread much there, we may reasonably conclude from that *Epistle* which the *Apostle* wrote to the *Ephesians* some Years after, when a *Prisoner* at *Rome*, in which he gives not the least *Intimation* of the *Errors* of the *Judaizing Christians* having obtain'd among 'em, nor gives 'em the least *Caution* against 'em, as he does to *other Churches* in which they were actually spread. Nay, in *St. Paul's Second Epistle* to *Timothy*, there is no mention made of the *Errors* of the *Judaizing Christians*, or of any *Division* they had occasion'd in any of the *Churches* among whom *Timothy* then labour'd. We have no Reason therefore to conclude, that these *grievous Wolves* mention'd *Acts XX. 29.* had enter'd into that *Church* of *Ephesus* or *torn the Flock*, when the *First Epistle* was wrote to *Timothy*; and accordingly this Argument of *Mr. Dr —*'s is of no Force to overturn that *Hypothesis*.

He saith, " There are other *Observations* which overturn *Mr. Owen's Conjecture*." If he'll please to produce 'em they shall be examin'd, and I believe will be found to have less Weight than those he has offer'd.

*Mr. Dr —* saith, " 'Tis acknowledg'd by all, that *Timothy* was at *Ephesus* when *St. Paul* wrote his *First Epistle* to him. And it cannot be positively prov'd, that he after remov'd from it, unless he went " to see *St. Paul* a little before his *Martyrdom*."

*Answ.* I believe indeed that *Timothy* was then at *Ephesus*, but he shou'd not say, 'tis acknowledg'd by all, when (as I shew'd him) *Dr. Whitby* doubts of it. But if he was there then, we have as positive a Proof as Matter of Fact can well admit that *he did remove from it*, because in the *Second Epistle* from *Rome* the Apostle expected him there: And in that to the *Hebrews*, 'tis evident he *was there*, and that not in *St. Paul's last Imprisonment*, and immediately before his *Martyrdom*, as *Mr. Dr——* supposes. For *St. Paul* and *Timothy* were then at *Liberty*, and design'd to come to those *Hebrews* to whom *St. Paul* wrote.

*Mr. Dr——* adds, " 'Tis also certain, that *St. Paul's* *Second Epistle* supposes *Timothy* to be at *Ephesus*, because he is desir'd to salute the Household of *Onesiphorus*, and *Aquila* and *Priscilla* who were all *Ephesians*."

*Answ.* Tho' the Debate about *Timothy's* being fix'd *Bishop* of *Ephesus* no way depend upon it, yet this is so far from being certain, that *Dr. Whitby* saith quite contrary to *Mr. Dr——* " 'Tis evident, that *Timothy* was not then at *Ephesus*, because *St. Paul* tells him, that he had sent *Tychicus* to *Ephesus*, which there was no Occasion for, if *Timothy* was at that Time there himself, 2 *Tim. IV. 12.*" And *Mr. Dr——*'s Argument for *Timothy's* being then at *Ephesus*, is far from making it certain. That *Priscilla* and *Aquila*, and *Onesiphorus* were *Ephesians*, is no way prov'd. 'Tis true *Apollos* found them at *Ephesus*, *Acts XXVIII. 6.* But 'tis not said, they were *Inhabitants* there; much less is this said any where of *Onesiphorus*. But shou'd we grant, they were *Inhabitants* at *Ephesus*, *Mr. Dr——*'s Argument is not conclusive. For all that he can infer from it is, that *Timothy* was either at that Time not very far from *Ephesus* (And that I grant him as in general very probable because he is order'd to bring the Cloak left at *Troas*) or rather, that *Timothy* in coming to him might have Occasion to pass thro' *Troas* to *Ephesus*; and that also is probable enough, because if he

was

was at  
Rome :  
from t  
of his  
shortly

*Mr.*  
" Chr  
" how  
" of  
guing

" *Tim*  
" wel  
" wit  
" *Bil*  
" fron  
" *Gho*  
To

" giv  
" tha  
" giv  
" felt  
" fine  
" tic  
" Ep  
" nie  
" an  
Ab

'tis m  
very  
turn  
then  
settle  
Supp  
viz.  
Pres  
Settl  
was  
Halt  
man



was at or near *Troas*, *Ephesus* wou'd lie in his Way to *Rome* : Whereas if he was at *Ephesus*, and was to come from thence to *Rome*, *Troas* wou'd be considerably out of his Way, when he was to use Diligence in coming shortly to the Apostle at *Rome*. v. 9.

Mr. Dr—— at last tells us, “ That tho’ Mr. Owen’s Chronological Account were true, he cannot see, how it wou’d destroy the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of *Timothy*.” He therefore brings Mr. B. in as arguing thus, “ That after this pretended Settlement of *Timothy*, the Apostle designing to take his last Farewel of this Church, commits it entirely to their Care, without taking the least Notice of their pretended Bishop, tho’ then present (or at no great Distance from ’em.) Nay, he assures ’em, that the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers or Bishops thereof. To this Mr. Dr—— replies, “ That this Charge given to the Elders of *Ephesus* is very different from that given to *Timothy*. The same Works are not given to both, but some are reserv’d to *Timothy* himself. Indeed the Charge at *Miletus* allows the *Ephesine* Elders to feed and take the Oversight of their particular Flocks, in such subordination to Bishops as the Epistle to *Timothy* puts ’em in. This was never denied any *Presbyter* under the Episcopal Government, and therefore can be no Objection.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. If Mr. Owen’s Chronological Account be true, ’tis manifest, that *Timothy*’s Abode at *Ephesus* must be very short; and it does not appear, that ever he return’d to reside among ’em. Let any impartial Reader then judge, whether the Pretence of his being their settled Bishop be not a most precarious and groundless Supposition, and confuted by plain Matter of Fact, viz. Many other Churches enjoying much more of his Presence and Residence and Care, after his pretended Settlement in that. Wou’d any Man say, such a one was settled Bishop of a Church, that spent a Quarter or Half a Year only in it, and all the rest of his Time for many Years together in distant Parts of the World?

And if *Timothy* was not then settled Bishop of *Ephesus*, and never that we know return'd to reside there, then the Argument is strong and conclusive, that after the Meeting at *Miletus*, the Government of it was committed to the *Presbyters* in common in the Apostle's *Valedictory Speech* to 'em, and that as the great Remedy against the *Schisms* the Apostle foresaw might arise.

But saith Mr. Dr—— “The same Works are not committed to both, but some reserv'd to *Timothy* himself. The *Elders* being allow'd to feed and oversee the Flock, but in such subordination to their Bishops as the *Epistle* to *Timothy* puts 'em in.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. What Works does Mr. Dr—— mean that were reserv'd to *Timothy* himself? Not that of admitting adult Members to Communion upon the Recognition of the Baptifinal Vow, which some call Confirmation; for then no such adult Members cou'd be admitted during *Timothy's* Life after he left 'em, and so this necessary Work must be left undone. Not that of Excommunication; for all Teachers in a Church had a Power to judge those within, and to cast scandalous Persons out of their Communion. And this Work must also have ceas'd upon *Timothy's* leaving them. Not that of Ordination; for this very *Epistle* is so far from appropriating it to *Timothy*, that it ascribes it to the *Presbytery* as their ordinary Province, 1 Tim. IV. 14. Not that of Government or Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; for the Apostle in this very *Epistle*, ascribes this *Παγία* or Government to all *Elders*, especially them that labour'd in Word and Doctrine, 1 Tim. V. 17. Nay, all these Acts of Government are included in feeding the Flock. Otherwise the Commission of Christ to the Apostle *Peter* himself, *John* XXI. 17. empower'd him only to teach in the Church without ruling in it. And if *Timothy* was not the settled Bishop of this Church; and at the Time of this Charge of the Apostles, had no Prospect of any future Residence in it, it concern'd the Apostle at that Meeting to appoint another Bishop for 'em, in subordination to whom they might for the Future act. But this

he

he is so  
of it to  
'em, a  
they w  
And th  
*Elders*  
that af  
Church  
had *Ti*  
'em an  
but wa  
*Directi*  
*tlement*  
of 'em  
their C  
*tion* o  
clear E  
*Schem*  
And  
prove  
some  
in th  
provin  
it wor  
only  
shew'  
fianic  
Super  
prov'  
Paroc  
such  
Fanc  
a Sup  
copac

A  
“ th  
“ G

he is so far from doing, that he *commits* the future Care of it to these *Elders* themselves, as his *last Charge* to 'em, and gives 'em no Intimation of any *superior Officer* they were for the future to act in *Subordination* to. And this *Epistle* to *Timothy* is so far from putting these *Elders* in any stated *Subordination* to any *fixed Bishop*, that after the writing it, the *sole Government* of that Church is committed to the *Elders* in common. Nor had *Timothy* himself during that short Residence among 'em any proper *Jurisdiction* over 'em as *subject* to him; but was only desir'd by the *Apostle* to give 'em such *Directions* from him as might tend to their better *Settlement*, after which the *Apostle* in taking his *Farewel* of 'em, intrusts the *Government* of that Church to their Care, without the least mention of the *Jurisdiction* of any *single Person* over 'em. So that here is clear Evidence that destroys the whole of Mr. Dr——'s Scheme.

And after all, I must add, That cou'd any Man prove (which I despair of seeing) that the *Apostle* left some *single Person* with a *Superiority* over these *Elders* in this Church of *Ephesus*, it wou'd be so far from proving the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy*, that it wou'd overturn it. For if the Church of *Ephesus* was only then *Parochial* or a *single Congregation* (and I have shew'd it was no more in *Ignatius's* Time when Christianity had spread more) this wou'd only prove the *Superiority* of a *Parochial Rector*. But I have fully prov'd the *Diocesan* to be entirely subversive of this *Parochial Episcopacy*. And let any Man judge whether such weak and ill-supported, and even inconsistent Fancies as these be a solid Foundation to build so vast a Superstructure as the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy* upon?

I now come to the pretended *Episcopacy* of *Titus*.

As to this Mr. Dr—— is pleas'd to tell us, " That there is as much Evidence of his being Bishop of Creet, as there can be for any Matter of Fact what-soever,



“ soever, if we will give any Credit to *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, *St. Chrysostome*, *St. Ambrose*, &c.

*Answ.* These *Writers* liv'd at too great a Distance from the *Apostolical* Age, and were too much us'd to speak of it in Conformity to the *Customs* and *Stile* of their own, to be allow'd as *decisive Judges* of this Debate, especially when what they affirm of *Titus's* being the *settled Bishop* of *Creet*, is so notoriously contradicted by the *Writers* of the *New-Testament*, who are much more *credible Witnesses* of such a Matter of Fact. And accordingly Mr. B. had shewn him, that if the common Account of *Chronologers* be allow'd, this *Epistle* to *Titus* was wrote before *St. Paul's* first *Imprisonment* at *Rome*, and the several Accounts of *Titus's* *Travels* after that, plainly demonstrate, that he was no more the *settled Bishop* of *Creet*, than of *Corinth*, *Nicopolis*, or the Province of *Macedonia*, *Dalmatia* or other *Places* where he perform'd the like temporary Service. And the *Epistle* to him plainly imports his *Service* there to be only temporary, since the *Apostle* calls him from thence to return to *Nicopolis*. And that the Reports of his returning to *Creet*, (as some wou'd have it) or his going to *Italy* (as others,) are given us by such whole Accounts are no way to be depended on.

To all this Mr. Dr—— makes no other Reply, than that he finds nothing in it but what has been sufficiently answer'd, but refers us to no *Author* in whom any such Answer is to be found. So that we must take that Matter on his own Word.

But I must tell him, That upon mature Consideration of this Matter, I am well satisfy'd, that neither Dr. *Lightfoot's* nor Bishop *Pearson's* Account of the Date of *St. Paul's* *Epistle* to *Titus* are true, and that the *Epistle* was wrote before *St. Paul's* Journey to *Macedonia* mention'd, *Acts* XX. 1. and therefore many Years before his Release from his First *Imprisonment* at *Rome*. *St. Paul* in his First *Epistle* to the *Romans* dated from *Corinth*, and sent by *Phabe*, mentions his having preach'd the Gospel from *Jerusalem* and round about to *Illyricum*,

*Illyricum*  
of his  
return  
bly d  
Second  
and I  
ment  
St. L  
up no  
'tis o  
of his  
thrice  
wreck  
speak  
*Acts*  
once  
often  
being  
the L  
ney t  
*Epistle*  
ment  
(whic  
fore l  
as fa  
concl  
*Tears*  
for t  
thenc  
*Tit. I*  
*Trave*  
from  
whic  
*Titus*  
left  
*cedon*  
*Corin*  
and  
*rintk*

*Illyricum*, Rom. XV. 19. He speaks of the First Time of his being at *Jerusalem*. And *Fourteen Years* after he returned thither, *Gal. II. 2.* Now it was most probably during these *Fourteen Years* between his *First* and *Second* Journey to *Jerusalem*, that he first visited *Creet* and left *Titus* there to perform that *temporary Service* mention'd, *Tit. I. 3.* And this was probably before *St. Luke* join'd him in his *Travels*, and therefore makes up no Part of his History in the *Acts*. And therefore 'tis observable that *St. Paul* tells us, *2 Cor. XI. 24, 25.* of his being *five Times scourg'd in the Jewish Synagogues*, *thrice beaten with Rods*, *being once ston'd*, *suffering Shipwreck thrice*, *being a Night and Day in the Deep*, and speaks of his *Perils by Sea*. Now in the History of the *Acts* we only read of his being *once scourg'd at Philippi*, *once ston'd at Lystra*; but nothing at all of his being so often scourg'd in the *Jewish Synagogues*, much less of his being *thrice Shipwreck'd*, or *being a Night and a Day in the Deep*. He was indeed once *Shipwreck'd* in his Journey to *Rome*, but that was after the Date of his *Second Epistle* to the *Corinthians*. And the History of the *Acts* mentions nothing of his either Preaching in *Arabia* (which yet is mention'd, *Gal. I. 17.* and was probably before his first going up to *Jerusalem*) nor of his travelling as far as *Illyricum*. It is therefore most reasonable to conclude, that it was in some Part of these *Fourteen Years Travels* that he visited *Creet*, and left *Titus* there for that *temporary Service* mention'd, *Tit. I. 5.* And thence sent for him to *Nicopolis* where he winter'd, *Tit. III. 12.* For that *Titus* was a Companion of his *Travels*, in some Part of these *Fourteen Years*, is evident from his bringing him along with him to *Jerusalem*, which he tells the *Galatians* he did, *Gal. II. 1, 3.* Of *Titus* we have no further Account till after the Apostle left *Ephesus*, *Acts XX. 1.* In his Journey towards *Macedonia*, *St. Paul* expected to meet *Titus* at *Troas* from *Corinth*, but met him not till he arriv'd in *Macedonia*, and by him and *Luke* sent his *Second Epistle* to the *Corinthians*, *2 Cor. VII. 5, 6.* compar'd with cap. VIII.

16, 18 and XII. 18. Of *Titus* we read no more, till we find him with the Apostle at *Rome*, and thence he went not to *Creet*, but to *Dalmatia*, 2 Tim. IV. 10. So that this Epistle to *Titus* seems to be the *First* that the Apostle wrote; and this Account of the many *Removals* and *Travels* of *Titus* after his being *First* left in *Creet* for that *temporary Service* there, entirely destroys all *Pretension* of his being a *settled Bishop* there; and any *other* of those Churches where his *Residence* was much *longer*, might with much greater Reason pretend to be his *Episcopal Sees*. But the Truth is, such an *itinerant Ministry* was utterly inconsistent with his fixed Relation to any particular Church as his ordinary Charge and Care.

Mr. B. had objected, That if the whole *Island* of *Creet* was the *Diocese* of *Titus*, (according to the present Model of *Episcopal Government*) he must be a *Metropolitan*, not a *Diocesan*. That *Island* having afterwards had several *Archbishops*, with *Bishops* under them.

To this Mr. Dr——gravely replies, “That he might “be a *Metropolitan*, and yet have a particular *Diocese* “to rule and govern, As the *Primate* of *Ireland* has “the *Diocese* of *Ardmagh*. And that if Mr. B. will “call *Titus Metropolitan* or *Archbishop*, he’ll not find “Fault, if he will give him some *Power* that *meer* “*Presbyters* cou’d not claim by their Commission.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. We are debating about Matter of Fact. Now since the Service *Titus* was to perform in *Creet*, related to all the *Cities* where there were any *Converts* to Christianity made; if *Titus* was *Bishop*, he must have the *Converts* of some one or more of those *Cities* for his *Diocese*, and his peculiar Charge: But of this there is not the least Intimation given us in that *Epistle*. The Service he was to perform, equally concern’d all the Christians in that *Island*, and there is no mention made of those of any particular *City* being committed to his Care above the rest. So that unless Mr. Dr—— turn the whole *Island* into a single *Diocese*;

*Titus*



*Titus* must be a *Metropolitan*, not a *Diocesan*. And then Mr. Dr—— shou'd tell us, where he finds that any single *Person* ever succeeded him in the *Government* of that *Island*. If none did, Then how comes his *Government* of it to be made an *Argument* for the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy*, when it no Ways appears that he had any *Successor* in it? Nay, since after *Parochial Episcopacy* came up, every *City* that had its *Presbyters* had also a *Bishop*, how comes it, that *Titus* who was to *ordain Elders in every City*, never ordain'd a *Bishop* to preside among 'em? For he cou'd no more do the ordinary *Work* of the *Primitive Parochial Bishops*, (i. e. *preach, administer the Sacraments, censure Offenders, take Care of the Poor, &c.*) for many *Cities* at once, than he cou'd be in some *Scores* of *Places* at once. But it was no such *Difficulty* to perform the *Service* assign'd him, as an *itinerant Teacher* in *visiting those Churches, ordaining Pastors, among 'em, and delivering 'em such Orders as he had receiv'd from the Apostle* for their future *Regulation*.

But saith Mr. Dr—— “ If Mr. B. will call *Titus* “ *Metropolitan* or *Archbishop*, I'll not find Fault with “ him, if he'll give him some Power that *meer Presby-* “ *ters* cou'd not claim by their *Commission*.

*Ans.* If Mr. Dr—— means the *Powers* of *Confirmation, Excommunication* and *Ordination*, which he makes the *distinctive Characters* of the *Episcopal Office*, I have already shewn him, they belong'd to all *Presbyters*; and for such *meer Presbyters* that have them not, I can find no such in all the *New Testament*, nor indeed in *Primitive Antiquity*, tho' one of the *Presbyters* in every *Congregation* in after Times under the Name of a *Bishop*, (and that but a *Parochial one*,) had the *chief Hand* in the *Exercise* of 'em.

And whereas Mr. Dr—— had inferr'd from *Titus's* being requir'd to *ordain Elders in every City*, that the *Power* of *Ordination* belong'd not to *Presbyters*, and was told, that he forgot the *Work* that *Titus* was sent for there; since if there had been *Presbyters* there before

fore, There was no need of his being left to *ordain them in every City*: To this Mr. Dr — now replies, “ That there were *Presbyters* there before, is put beyond Dispute by the Records of the Church, and is exactly agreeable to *St. Paul’s Practice*, who always *ordain’d Elders* wherever he founded a Church. And that *Titus* was left to ordain ’em, because there were not enough ordain’d for the whole Island, and *meer Presbyters* cou’d not confer Orders, &c.

*Ans.* What Records of the Church put it beyond Dispute, that there were *Presbyters* ordain’d in *Creet*, before *Titus* was left there, Mr. Dr — best knows; for I cou’d never hear of any such. I presume, ’tis such Records as told him of the *Sedition* in *St. Clement’s Time*, by the *Presbyters* of *Corinth* against their *Bishop*, and of the *Deacons* taking the *Bishop’s Part*, and several other such Matters of Fact. If he’ll produce us any authentick ones that assert any such Thing, their Testimony shall be consider’d. That *St. Paul* always ordain’d *Presbyters* himself wherever he planted a Church, is more than Mr. Dr — has any where prov’d. That he usually did so, wherever he made any long Stay, will be freely granted. That he made any such long Stay in *Creet*, is what Mr. Dr — I believe will not attempt to prove. If he had, he wou’d not have left so many Things undone, towards the Settlement of his Converts there in due Church Order. And we have therefore just ground to reckon the Ordination of *Presbyters* among the *[τὰ λείποντα]* Things left undone. And no wonder it shou’d be so, when it requir’d some Time to choose out of his Converts in every City, such as were best instructed in the Christian Doctrine themselves, and best qualify’d to be appointed Teachers of others. For this Service he left *Titus* this *itinerary Teacher*. But how it shou’d be hence inferr’d that these Teachers shou’d not afterwards be capable of committing the same Doctrine to other faithful Men, which was committed to them as the publick *Depositories* of it, I cannot see; and presume every judicious Reader will think it a very unreasonable

reasonable Inference. If they could not, they must want ordain'd Ministers in that Island to this Day; for I could never find, that *Titus* had any Successor either in his *unfix'd Ministry*, or in this Service he perform'd for the whole Island. For what he adds of *meer Presbyters* never claiming this Right, I have already prov'd, that none claim'd this Power of Ordination for Two Hundred Years after the *Apostles*, but such *Parochial Pastors*, or *Bishops*, as Mr. Dr——— accounts now *meer Presbyters*, and that even those *Parochial Pastors* excluded not their *Curates* themselves (the ancient *Presbyters*) from the Exercise of it. And till he has disprov'd the Evidence I have produc'd, I hope we shall hear no more of this Argument, from the *Episcopacy* of *Titus*, nor be troubled about what his *mere Presbyters* can or cannot do. For we know of no Divine Institution for such *meer Presbyters* at all, nor have any such among us.

## REMARKS on the IXth CHAPTER.

I Now come to Mr. Dr———'s IXth Chapter concerning the *Angels* of the Seven Churches in *Asia*, who (he saith) were *single Persons* and *proper Bishops*.

On which I shall content my self with a few brief Remarks.

Mr. Dr——— instead of bringing any solid Argument to prove the *Angels* of the Churches *single Persons*, endeavours to supply that defect by the Number of his *Authorities*, as if it were not as easy for me, were it worth the while, nor to any valuable Purpose, to cite him as many and as learned Authors, who understand the Word *Angel* collectively, as including all the *Pastors* of the Church. But what would this signify to decide the Question?



2. For those that by the *Angel* understand both *Pastors* and the *Churches* under their Care, Mr. Dr—— may see his *Objections* against their Opinion answer'd in *Pool's Criticks*. But because that is not my own, I shall only consider, what he objects against *their's*; that suppose all the *Pastors* included under the Name of the *Angel*.

3. Mr. B. had said, That since there were more *Teachers* than one in each of those *Churches*, they must be included either under the *Stars* or the *Candlesticks*. They cannot be comprehended under the *Candlesticks*, because it was their *Office* to give *Light*, they must be therefore comprehended under the *Star* or *Angel*. As therefore the *Candlestick* is taken collectively for the whole *Body* of the *People* that are taught, so must the *Star* or *Angel* be taken collectively for all that were their authoriz'd *Teachers*. For otherwise we must suppose these *Teachers* excluded from any Share in the *Advoices* given, or *Commendations* and *Censures* pass'd in those *Epistles*.

To this Mr. Dr—— replies, That this cannot be, till Mr. B. can make one *Angel* several *Angels*. He denies not, "But the rest of the *Presbyters* may be concern'd in these *Epistles* tho' they are address'd to single *Persons*, who were the *Bishops* and *Governors* of those *Churches*, they being the most considerable part of them. Thus St. *John* writing to the *Church* of *Smyrna* thus speaks, *Fear none of those Things thou shalt suffer, behold the Devil shall cast some of you into Prison.*" Now by this Means, the *Angel* of the *Church* is not made the whole *Company* of *Presbyters*, any more than the *Archbishop* of *Dublin* would be made his whole *Clergy*, if such a *Letter* were directed to him, &c.

Ans. Mr. Dr—— (on whom the Proof here lies) plainly begs the *Question*, when he tells us, that one *Angel* cannot be made several *Angels*. If *Angel* be taken collectively, one *Angel* may signify several *Pastors* or *Teachers*. If indeed Mr. Dr—— could prove, that these *Epistles* make mention of any *Clergy* distinct from the

the *Angel* to  
tempts  
any fr  
strict f  
all the  
Rev. II  
Impostor  
not, but  
the *Cler*  
held the  
sabel th  
those th  
ogue of  
the leas  
*Churches*  
low, th  
Name  
in the  
deliver  
poses fir  
Primitiv  
already  
Chapter  
Mr.  
*Church*  
love, an  
lestick  
would b  
f only  
*Presbyter*  
That the  
his, do  
his Mr.  
the san  
Ans.  
reasonabl  
ad spre  
were inf

the *Angel*, there were some ground for his taking *Angel* to signify a single Person. But this he never attempts. And I cannot find any Ground to conclude any such Thing. There are no settled Teachers distinct from the *Angel*, either applauded or censur'd in all those *Epistles*. The false *Apostles* mention'd *Rev. II. 2.* were no such settled Teachers but vagrant *Impostors*. Those that call'd themselves *Jews* but were not, but were of the *Synagogue of Satan*, were not of the *Clergy* but *Laitie*, *Rev. II. 9.* Such were they that held the *Doctrine of Balaam*, *v. 14.* Such was *Jezabel* that call'd herself a *Propheteß*, *v. 20.* Such were those that call'd themselves *Jews*, but were the *Synagogue of Satan*, *Rev. III. 9.* And since there is not the least Intimation of any settled Teachers in those Churches as distinguish'd from the *Angel*, it does follow, that either they are comprehended under the Name of *Angel* taken collectively, or are unconcern'd in the *Admonitions*, the *Commendations*, and *Censures* there deliver'd. As for Mr. Dr——'s Parallel, it supposes such a Conformity between the present and the *Primitive Model of Church Government*, as I have already fully disprov'd in the *Remarks on his Second Chapter*.

Mr. B. had also objected, That the *Angel* of the Church of *Ephesus* is charg'd with leaving his *First Love*, and threaten'd that if he repented not, his *Candlestick* should be remov'd out of its Place. But where would be the Reason and Justice of such a Sentence, if only the *Bishop* was faulty, but the rest of the *Presbyters* and *People* free. And Mr. B. had added, That those who suppose *Timothy* then *Bishop of Ephesus*, do in Effect charge him with this Crime. To this Mr. Dr—— replies, "That the Case would be the same, if we take *Angel* for all the *Pastors*."

Ans. It would not be the same, because it is more reasonable to suppose that this Declension of Zeal had spread among the *People* too, if all the *Pastors* were infected, than if one single Person, (i. e. one *Dio-*

cesan Bishop) only were guilty. For then many Parochial Congregations, and their Pastors too might be unconcern'd in the Guilt. And for the Reflexion that is here cast upon Timothy on the Supposition of his being then Bishop of Ephesus, Mr. Dr—— passes it over in Silence.

Mr. Dr—— to solve the Objection has advanc'd a new and somewhat surprizing Interpretation, that by Removing the Candlestick out of its Place, is meant, That the Church of Ephesus shou'd no longer be the Metropolitcal Church, and the Bishop of it have no longer a Superiority over the other Bishops of the lesser Asia. So that the Bishop is threatned to lose his Metropolitcal Honour, and here only the Bishop is punish'd for his Offence.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. That the Church of Ephesus was a Metropolitcal Church in the Apostolick Age, Archbishop Usber has no where prov'd, nor is there any Shadow of Ground to believe, that any such stated Prebeminence of the Bishop of the Metropolis above his Brethren, obtain'd in the Second (not to say the Third) Century. Ignatius in his Epistle, mentions the Bishop of Ephesus, but takes not the least Notice of his Metropolitcal Dignity. If this were the Sense of the Place, the Superiority of a Metropolitan wou'd be a Matter of Divine Right. But this Mr. Dr—— himself fairly denies, when he tells us, that the Superiority of an Archbishop is a Matter owing only to Civil Constitution. There had been no such Civil Constitution at that Time in favour of the Metropolitcal Dignity. And therefore Mr. Dr——'s Interpretation is guilty of the Absurdity of threatning the Bishop of Ephesus to degrade him from a Dignity, which (according to himself) he never enjoy'd, nor was like to do, till the Government of the Empire came into the Hands of Christian Emperors.

His Answer to the Third Argument drawn from Rev. II. 19. is founded on his precarious Supposition of some Clergy in the Church of Thyatira distinct from the An-

gel.  
App  
4  
the  
Mean  
cordi  
learn  
foot,  
row  
the  
was  
but w  
To  
ning  
Synag  
and t  
Dioces  
An  
Chapt  
marks  
Ild C  
of Ep  
or Con  
conclu  
wrote  
" the  
well t  
Confor  
Govern  
succeed  
ter of  
pacy n  
cbial.  
patible  
ter. S  
if he  
I sh  
pos'd a  
byters,



gel. For which he has offer'd nothing that has the Appearance of an Argument.

4. Mr. B. had further said, That if we understand the Word *Angel* of a *single Person*, it will by no Means prove him to be a *Diocesan Bishop*. And accordingly Mr. B. had shew'd him, that the most learned Antiquaries (such as *Mouns. Basnage*, *Dr. Lightfoot*, *Dr. Stillingfleet*) tell us, The Phrase was borrow'd from the *Jewish Synagogue*, and signify'd only the *Inspector* or *Superintendent* of the *Congregation*, who was of no distinct Order from the other *Teachers* of it, but was only *Præses* in the *Bench of Elders*.

To this Mr. Dr — replies, That Mr. B's Reasoning thereon, being founded entirely on the *Jewish Synagogue*, he has said enough of it already, *Chap. VI.* and that he has all along excluded the *Question* about *Diocesan Bishops*.

*Ans.* What Mr. Dr — has offer'd in his VIth Chapter, has been consider'd and refuted in the *Remarks* on it. He'll also find in the *Remarks* on his IId Chapter, That in *Ignarius's* Time, the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Smyrna* were no more than *Parochial* or *Congregational* ones. And therefore we may justly conclude 'em to have been such when these *Epistles* were wrote. But for what Mr. Dr — adds, "That he excludes the *Question* about a *Diocesan Bishop*;" He might as well tell us, That he gives up the Cause. For 'tis the Conformity of the present *Diocesan Episcopacy* to the Government of the *Apostolical* and the immediately succeeding Ages he has undertaken to defend as a Matter of *Divine Right*. And I know of no other *Episcopacy* now Establish'd but what is *Diocesan*, not *Parochial*. And these Two I have shewn him to be incompatible, and the *Former* built on the Ruins of the *Latter*. So that he has brought the Dispute to a fair Issue, if he gives up this main Point in Debate.

I shall only add, That if the *Angel* here be suppos'd a *Parochial Bishop* as *Præses* of the *Bench of Presbyters*, it does by no Means follow, that he appropriates

priated any such Powers as those of *Confirmation*, *Excommunication*, and *Ordination* to himself; nor has Mr. Dr—— offer'd one Syllable from those *Epistles* to prove, that they were appropriated to him. And for the Churches of the Three First Centuries, I have shewn him, that they did it not, even after a greater Distinction between the Bishop and his *Presbyters* (i. e. the *Parish Rector* and his *Assistants*) obtain'd in the Church, than we can trace any Footsteps of in the *Apostolical Age*, and in the Time wherein *Clemens Romanus* flourish'd.

For Dr. Maturice, Let Mr. Dr—— try, Whether he can furnish him with Arguments to overthrow what is alledg'd in the *Remarks* on his Second Chapter to prove the *Primitive Episcopacy* *Parochial* and not *Diocesan*.

5. For the *Proposals* towards an *Accommodation* at the *Savoy Conference*, Mr. Dr—— saith, "It were easy to shew, who were to blame why it had no better Effect, and what unreasonable Terms were insisted on by the Dissenters to break it off."

*Ans.* That Matter has already been set in so clear a Light in Mr. *Baxter's Life*, and in the *Papers* that pass'd on both Sides, as is sufficient to convince all unprejudic'd Persons, That the *Commissioners* on the *Non-Conformists* Side, went as far as their *Judgment* and *Conscience* wou'd allow 'em towards an *Accommodation* of those Differences, (and particularly in proposing *Archbishop Usher's Model of Episcopacy*, which was far enough from what this *Author* calls a *Presbyterian Parity*.) Whereas the *Majority* of the *Commissioners* on the other Side were inflexible, and made not one Step by any considerable *Concessions* towards *Unity* and *Peace*. And therefore to lay the *Guilt* of the *Division* that ensued on those that did their utmost *salva Conscientia* to prevent it, instead of charging it on those whose unrelenting *Stiffness* and *Rigour*, in making the *Terms of Conformity* harder than ever they had been before, was the true Cause

of it,  
judgin  
advise  
Guilt  
Mr  
" cou  
" the  
" ers;  
" Cle  
" Cor  
An  
That  
where  
ous Co  
to arri  
pect (r  
rest) t  
Bishop  
tail'd  
Transf  
open  
forme

I no  
co  
follow  
1.  
and v  
Reade  
Rema  
2.  
p. 70.  
byters

of it, will not be thought with impartial Men, *the judging Righteous Judgment*. And I wou'd in Charity advise Mr. Dr——, not to draw any part of that Guilt on his own Head by any attempt to defend it.

Mr. Dr——'s hand being in, He adds, "That he cou'd demonstrate, that the Interest (in keeping up the *Division*) lies on the side of the *Dissenting Teachers*; and it wou'd add to their (*i. e. the Conforming Clergy's*) Interest, if they had no regard to their Consciences, to promote *Presbytery*."

*Answ.* If Mr. Dr—— can demonstrate this, *i. e.* That 'tis more a *Teacher's* Interest to be on that side where 40 l. or 50 l. or an 100 l. per Annum of *precarious Contributions*, is the utmost he can usually expect to arrive to, than to be on that side where he may expect (if he be a Man of *Learning* and *Merit*, or *Interest*) to reach to the *Legal Revenues* of a *Deanery*, or a *Bishoprick*; (besides all the secular Dignity that is entail'd on the latter,) he may next set up for proving *Transubstantiation*; for the latter does not carry a more open contradiction to *Sense* and *Reason* than the former.

---

### The CONCLUSION.

I now come to Mr. Dr——'s *Conclusion*, and since it contains little of *Argument*, shall dismiss it with the following Remarks.

1. How Mr. Dr—— has manag'd this Controversy, and with what Success, I shall freely leave to the Readers Judgment, on his impartial perusal of these Remarks.

2. As to *Blondell's Apology*, Mr. B. had said *Postscript*, p. 70. That he has undeniably prov'd, That the *Presbyters* of the 4th and 5th Ages had a far greater share



in the Government of the Churches, than the present *Diocesan Frame* allows 'em.

Mr. Dr—— in answer to this, tells us, " That *Blondell* frankly profess'd, he wrote that Book only to please a Party; and to prove this, he produces a *Letter* of Dr. *Peter Du-Moulin* to Mr. *Durell*.

*Ans.* Were all the *matters of Fact* mention'd in the *Letter* true, they prove no such thing as what Mr. Dr—— asserts, That he confess'd his having wrote that Book only to please a Party. They prove no more, than that he struck out those particular Expressions at the request of some Friends. Besides, a Man may think well of the *Ancient Parochial Episcopacy*, and with it restor'd, that has no such Thoughts of that *Diocesan Episcopacy* that is destructive of it: And 'tis not *Blondel's Authority* that we value, but his *Arguments*, his Book having never receiv'd any full or satisfactory *Answer*. But Mr. Dr—— will here find the *Controversy* set on another foot, viz. the true extent of the *Primitive Bishop's ordinary Charge*; and consequently the utter inconsistency of the *Primitive Episcopacy* with the present *Diocesan Model*, which *Blondel* has scarce once touch'd on in his whole Book; and which entirely overthrows all Arguments for the *Divine Right* of *Diocesan Episcopacy*, drawn from the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church*, after the distinction of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* obtain'd in it.

3. As for *Grotius*, he might justly assert the early rise of *Parochial Episcopacy*; but if he trace it up to the *Apostles* time, I hope what has been offer'd is sufficient to prove the contrary. But I must again ask, what this signifies in defence of the present *Diocesan Model*, that has put down these *Ancient Bishops*, and engross'd several Powers of many scores of such *Bishops* into one single Hand? And if Mr. Dr—— go on to confound these two inconsistent Things, I hope no intelligent Reader will ever do it.

But

But  
answer  
find v  
defenc  
For  
ted th  
as that  
St. Cle  
but in  
For  
Dioces  
Mr. D  
nistry.  
quence  
And  
shou'd  
Truth  
Conclu  
has be  
have  
for th  
sitated  
prov'  
they  
the e  
Doctr  
4.  
from  
" stic  
" sup  
" est  
" Pr  
" its  
" In  
in th  
Refle  
TI  
bate  
nal I

But what need this *Author* trouble himself with answering the *Arguments* of *Grotius*, when he will find work enough to answer those offer'd, and now defended?

For the *Apostles* I have shew'd him, they committed the Government of every particular Church (such as that of *Ephesus*) not to one, but more *Bishops*. And *St. Clemens* assures us, they did so not only in *Cities*, but in the *Countries*.

For the *Reformed Churches Abroad* that want the *Diocesan Form* of Government, I have shewn, That *Mr. Dr——*'s Principles null their *Ordinations* and *Ministry*. And tho' he pretends not to draw that Consequence himself, it does unavoidably flow from 'em; And 'tis so absurd and uncharitable a Consequence, as shou'd oblige him to examine again and again the Truth of those Principles, from which so wretched a Conclusion may be justly drawn. And I hope what has been said may convince him, that the Principles have as little of Truth, as they have of Charity; and for the pretence of the *Reformed Churches* being necessitated to want *Diocesan Episcopacy*, I have fully disprov'd it from their publick *Confessions of Faith*, where they found their *Form* of Church Government upon the equality of all ordinary *Pastors*, according to the Doctrine of the *New-Testament*.

4. For the *Argument* which *Mr. Dr——* subjoyns from *Dr. Beveridge*, viz. "That there are no Ecclesiastical *Canons* or *Laws*, on which the distinction and superiority of *Bishops* from and above *Presbyters* is establish'd; and which (he tells us) is an undeniable Proof, That the *Episcopal Order* and *Authority*, owes its beginning not to *Ecclesiastical*, but to *Apostolical Institution*," &c. It has receiv'd so full an Answer in the foregoing Papers, that I need only add a few brief Reflections thereon.

That the *Diocesan Episcopacy*, (about which the Debate lyes) is the same with the *Primitive Congregational Episcopacy*, is the very Foundation of *Dr. Beveridge's*

Argument. But this I have at large prov'd the  
Falshood of, and I hope with *demonstrative Evidence*.

'Tis another Foundation of Dr. *Beveridge's* Argument, That the *Primitive Bishops* claim'd the *same Authority* over their *Presbyters*, that *Diocesan Bishops* now claim over *theirs*. But this also I have shewn to be an egregious *Mistake*.

Since I have fully prov'd the *Distinction* between the *Primitive Bishop* and *Presbyters*, to have been only like that between the *Rector* of the *Parish*, and his *Assistant-Curates*, I wou'd desire Mr. Dr—— to shew us, when this *Distinction* between the *Rector* and his *Curates* begun? On what *Ecclesiastical Laws* and *Canons* it was first establish'd? By what *Law*, by what *Authority* do *Rectors* claim such a *Presidency* over the *Curates*, in managing the Affairs of their *Parochial Church*? Why do they usurp a *Power* they cannot claim from *Christ* or his *Apostles*? And why did the *Curates* so tamely submit to the *Usurpation*, or never murmur or complain of it? If he can resolve this *Superiority* of the *Parish Rectors* into no other *Original* than the *Custom* of the *Church*, what need he seek any higher for the same *Distinction* between the *Primitive Parochial Bishop* and his *Presbyters*? And he knows that *St. Jerome* has assign'd the same *Original* of that, viz. the *Custom* of the *Church*, and has assign'd also the end and use of it to preserve the *Unity* of particular Churches, which was thought better secur'd by one *Pastor's* being chiefly intrusted with the *Care* and *Government* of every *Parish Church*; than by an *Absolute Parity* among many. I may add, That as the *Antients* divided the Office of *Pastors*, so they did that of *Deacons*. But can Mr. Dr—— tell us when this *Division* begun, on what *Ecclesiastical Law* or *Canon* it was first establish'd? How some *Deacons* came first to have a *Superiority* over others call'd their *Subdeacons*? Now if this *Division* of that lower Office in the *Primitive Church* into two *Degrees*, had no higher Foundation than meer *Custom*, what



what need we seek for any other Original of the Division of the Bishops or Presbyters Office? (which so manifestly appears to be one and the same in the Apostles time. See 1 Tim. III. Tit. I.) I might also mention several Rites of Worship that generally obtain'd, the beginning of which cannot be trac'd, nor any Ecclesiastical Canons or Laws assign'd for their establishment. (Such as mixing the Wine with Water in the Eucharist, for which Cyprian groundlessly alledges Apostolical Tradition, &c.) And yet it wou'd be absurd to pretend any Divine Institution for 'em. If indeed the change in the Primitive Form of Government had been what Mr. Dr——'s Argument supposes it; That whereas every particular Church or Congregation had several Pastors or Rectors, one Man undertook at once to deprive some Scores or Hundreds of 'em, of a great part of their Pastoral Authority, and had engros'd it into his own Hand, with respect to all the Churches of a large Province; then indeed it wou'd have been very unaccountable, if such a remarkable Change had been yielded to without any murmur or complaint. But when a Bishop's Church was at first confin'd to the bounds of a single Congregation; when it gradually swell'd to the bounds of an overgrown Parish: When City Bishops gradually put down the Power of the Chorepiscopi or Country Bishops, turning 'em by degrees into meer Curates; when their Episcopal Churches were many Ages on the increasing band before they arriv'd at the bulk of Modern Diocesses, the change is very easily accountable: And 'tis no difficult thing to name several Canons that help'd forward this Alteration in favour of Episcopal Grandeur, (as I might instance in those that forbid the making Bishops, not only in Villages, but lesser Towns; and those that subjected the Bishops of lesser Cities, to those of greater ones.) The Truth is, he must be an utter stranger to Church History, that does not know, That the Preheminence of Bishops, both with respect to the extent of their

their *Charge*, and the *Powers* they *claim'd*, did by several *steps* arrive to it's present *height*: And that many of these were complain'd of and oppos'd, tho' in vain. So that this mighty Demonstration, is after all founded on a palpable *mistake* of plain *Matters of Fact*, and vanishes when those are truly represented.

5. For the Advice he offers to *Dissenters* at the foot of this imaginary Demonstration, they can easily tell him, That they are far from being *in love with implicit Faith*, having no such Clause in their *Confession of Faith*, as that which is (by what means I pretend not to say) inserted in the Twentieth of the Thirty nine Articles, *That the Church has Authority in matters of Faith*. That 'tis such as he, that digests not only *improbable*, but *absurd Paradoxes*. (Such as that of *Parochial* being the same with *Diocesan Episcopacy*) And they have in this Matter a fair offer to make to Mr. Dr——: Let but every *Parochial Church* have it's *Bishop* and *Presbyters*; let these *Bishops* have the same *Power* (and no more) than the *Antient Parochial Bishops* had; and let no *Diocesan* deprive many scores of 'em; of several branches of their *Power* by engrossing 'em into his *own Hands*; and if they make this *Form of Church Government* any ground of *Separation*, (when no other *sinful Terms* are impos'd) then they'l allow Mr. Dr——'s *Charge*, *That their Principles wou'd have oblig'd 'em to separate from the whole Christian Church for Fourteen Hundred Years*. And since Christianity flourish'd under this *Parochial Episcopacy* for some Centuries before *Diocesan Episcopacy* ever appear'd, and much more before it generally prevail'd; Mr. Dr—— may see how weak and impertinent his Harangue appears. If he be in good earnest for the *Antient Episcopacy's* being restor'd, let him get it effected, and we'll give him a *Thousand Thanks*. If he be not, to what purpose does he represent us as opposers of it? Nay, how justly may the Argument be retorted, that if those who plead for the *Divine Right*

of

of D  
first  
cut  
and t  
quent  
there  
When  
such  
Becau  
Bishop  
have  
ver l  
Disc  
Ends  
and  
have  
ever,  
be al  
mana  
ing th  
But  
gainf  
(as h  
enqui  
scien  
cesan  
Why  
but c  
it, an  
even  
steria  
tive  
Matt  
Sir T  
gatio  
there  
deed  
tion  
make

of *Diocesan Episcopacy* had liv'd in the two or three first *Ages*, their *Principles* must have oblig'd 'em to cut off themselves from the *whole Christian Church*; and to have declar'd all their *Ordinations* (and consequently all their *Sacraments*) void and null, because there was then no *Diocesan Bishop* to Ordain at all. Whereas our *Principles* would have oblig'd us to no such harsh *Censures* of 'em, or *Separation* from 'em: Because, tho' we think not this *Superiority* of a *Parish Bishop* or *Rector*, above his *Presbyters* or *Curates*, to have been of *Divine Institution*; yet we shou'd never have made it any ground of *Separation*, because *Discipline* might have been exercis'd, and all the great *Ends* of *Church Government* attain'd under that *Form* and *Model* of it; and even the *Laity* themselves (who have the best *Title* to the *Name* of the *Church*; however, the *Clergy* strive of late to *Monopolize* it) wou'd be allow'd their liberty of *Advice* and *Consent* in the management of *Church Affairs*; and their right of electing their own *Pastors*, as they enjoy'd it for many *Ages*. But if this *Gentleman* and others of his Stamp, be against the restoring of *Primitive Episcopacy*, let them (as he speaks) put their *Hands upon their Hearts*, and enquire how they can answer it to *God* and their *Consciences*, why they so warmly contend for that *Diocesan Episcopacy* that is destructive of the *Primitive*? Why they not only plead for the *Divine Right* of it, but condemn all those as *Schismatics* that dissent from it, and prefer the *Primitive Episcopacy* before it; nay even declare all their *Ordinations*, and all their *ministerial Administrations* (tho' perform'd by true *Primitive Bishops*) null and void? We no way dispute the *Matter of Fact* alledg'd in *Sir E. D's Speech*, and *Sir Thomas Ashton's Review*, that there were *Congregational Bishops* in the *Primitive Church*. We think there were no other in the *Apostolical Age*. We do indeed think *Subject-Presbyters* or *Curates* to be a *Deviation* from the *Apostolical Practice*, but shou'd never make it a *Ground of Separation* where it does obtain.

But



But if those *Gentlemen* speak of *Diocesan Bishops*, it will appear from the foregoing *Remarks*, that no such *Bishops* can be found in the best and purest Times. And those that deny this, run their Heads against all the early Monuments in the Christian Church. And of this I am so fully perswaded, that I shall on this Occasion borrow Mr. Dr ———'s own Words, *Truth is too bright and glorious to be always eclips'd; it will certainly shine out some Time or other; and it would not fail to do so even in this particular* (of the *Primitive Episcopacy* being only *Parochial*) *did not some Mens Interests too deeply engage 'em against it*. Whose Interests indeed are most likely to do it, I must leave Mr. Dr ——— to judge.

And Model of it; and even the Early themselves (who have the best Title to the Name of the Church; how ever, the Clergy strive of late to monopolize it) would be allowed their liberty of Address and Counsel in the management of Church Affairs; and their right of electing their own Pastors, as they enjoy'd it for many Ages. But if this Controversy and others of this Stamp be against the restoring of *Primitive Episcopacy*, let them (as he speaks) put their Hands upon their Heads, and swear, why they so warmly contend for that *Primitive Episcopacy* that is destructive of the *Primitive* Church. Why they not only plead for the Divine Right of it, but condemn all those as *schismatics* that dissent from it, and reject the *Primitive Episcopacy* before it; nay even declare all their *Ordinances* and all their *Worship* *invalid* (the performance of the *Worship*) null and void? We no way dispute the *Validity* of the *Worship* alleged in St. A. D. 325, and the *Thomas Aton's* *Reasons*, that there were *Canon* *Antient Bishops* in the *Primitive Church*. We do not think there were no other in the *Apollonian Age*. We do not think *St. Basil* *Episcopacy* or *Canon* to be a *Primitiv* *Canon* from the *Apollonian* *Age*, but should never make it a Ground of *Separation* where it does obtain.

were

adgi

Wor

B. A.

mid

ind

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

# APPENDIX.

**N**OW the Argument is finish'd, I am at Leisure to add a few Remarks on Mr. Drury's Preface and Introduction.

For the former, I shall only say that I heartily approve the good Advice given in it, of *Searching after so noble an object as that of Truth, with a Mind empty of all Concern for a Party, and observing all the Laws of Decency and good Manners in pleading for it, using soft Words and hard Arguments.* I wish I could complement him so far as to be able to say, he has in this Book follow'd his own Advice. And I have us'd my best Endeavours to give him no just Occasion of charging me with counter-acting it. But whose Conduct has been most suitable thereto, must after all be left to the Judgment of unbiass'd Readers.

For his Introduction. I am sorry that the World shou'd be troubled with any Thing that is *Personal*, and has no Relation to the Merits of the Cause between Mr. B. and him. And therefore shall be as brief as possible, in what I have to say in Justification of the Complaints Mr. B. had made of his *injuriously Reflexions.*

He endeavours to prejudice his Readers against the *Apology*, by telling 'em, "That whereas Mr. B. begins it with saying, That his Sermon concerning the *Scriptural Bishop*, was reprinted not only without,

" But

“ but against his Consent ; the Bookfellers who were  
 “ concern’d in it do assure him it was neither.

To set this small Matter of Fact in its true Light, I must now tell him, none of the *Bookfellers*, concern’d in the Reprinting the Sermon, ever spoke with Mr. B. about it. They sent their Printer Mr. *Rhames* to him, to desire his Consent to the Reprinting the Sermon and the *Appendix* ; and what Answer Mr. B. gave him, the Reader may see by Mr. *Rhames* his own Certificate which I have here subjoin’d.

*I do hereby certify, That when the Bookfellers who reprinted Mr. Boyse’s Sermon concerning the Scriptural Bishop, sent me to desire his Consent for their reprinting it, he peremptorily refus’d to give his Consent thereto.*

Aaron Rhames, Septemb. 30. 1709.

And since Mr. *Rhames* told Mr. Dr—— this before the Printing of his *Vindication*, it shou’d in all Reason have prevented his arrainging Mr. B’s Veracity, in a Matter wherein it will not be so easy for him to vindicate his own. For Mr. B. cannot learn that his *Bookfellers* told him any such Thing ; he is sure if they did, they told him an Untruth.

’Tis true indeed, when they had actually begun to reprint the Sermon, notwithstanding Mr. B’s declared Dissent, he was willing to correct it, that it might have no other Imperfections than its own, and resolv’d to add a Poscript by way of Apology and Defence.

Mr. B. had said concerning Mr. Dr——’s Charge, “ That ’tis an heavy Charge indeed, if it had any  
 “ Thing of Truth in it : But if all that is ill in it, is  
 “ entirely drawn from Mr. Dr——’s Imagination, or  
 “ rather Invention, &c. he must consider whether  
 “ the Charge will not recoil, &c.” And added, “ I do  
 “ not despair by what follows, to convince all unpre-  
 “ judiced Persons even Mr. Dr—— himself, how e-  
 “ gregiously he has wrong’d me in the greatest Part of  
 “ it.” Upon this Mr. Dr—— thus descants:

“ Did



“ Did not this *Author* just now say, There was nothing of Truth in it? Are not his own Words, here is an heavy Charge indeed, if it had any Thing of Truth in it? Which according to the best of my Understanding supposeth it has none. And yet at the End of that short Paragraph he saith, I have wrong’d him only in the greatest Part of it. Something then, and nothing of my Accusation is true, which is such a palpable Contradiction, as I confess my uncommon Ignorance cannot reconcile.

*Ans.* If Mr. Dr. ——— will please to review the Passage without his own *Addition* to it, he’ll find the Sense of it very plain, and every way consistent with it self. That Mr. B. finds nothing of Truth at all in his Charge so far as it accuses him of any ill Thing, or faulty in what he had said. And in the greatest Part of the Charge, the Falseness and Injustice is so notorious, that Mr. B. despairs not of convincing Mr. Dr. — himself how egregiously he has wrong’d him in it. ’Tis therefore Mr. Dr. —’s own Mistake to say, “ That Mr. B. allows something of his Accusation to be true. And that he owns him to have only wrong’d him in the greatest Part of it.” For Mr. B. had charg’d him with wronging him in the *whole*, and only suppos’d that in the *greatest Part* of it, the Injustice was so manifest, that Mr. B. hop’d to convince himself of it. And I am sorry, That the plain Evidence Mr. B. laid before him, has had no better Effect to make him sensible of it.

As to the First Charge of branding our *Bishopricks* as *pompous Sine-Cures*, to which Mr. B. had so fully answered, *Postscript* p. 59, 60, 61. The Sum of Mr. Dr. —’s Answer lies in these Two Things.

“ That if that Passage refer not to the Establish’d Church, it refers to nothing at all. And that it does not follow, That those who abuse any Office, must think the Office design’d for no other End than to be abus’d, *Introd.* p. 4, 5.

To

To this I have this short Answer to give, that this Passage evidently refers to no *National Church* at all, but to all Ambitious and Worldly *Candidates* of the *Episcopal Office* in any Church whatever, whose practical Notion of the Office is here estimated, not so much from what they avowedly profess, as from their real and notorious *Practice*. And Mr. B. speaks there of such as think they have sufficiently discharg'd the Duties of their Function, by turning the most of 'em over to *Delegates* and *Deputies*, and do not take this for any Abuse of their Office at all. And for the Non-sense he tells us one of Mr. B's *Answerers* has charg'd upon that Clause, if that Gentleman pleases, instead of [*the Bishoprick*] to put [*the Office of a Bishop*] which is the same Thing, he'll find the Charge of *Non-sense* immediately vanishes, and appears to be ridiculous trifling with Words.

For his Charge of Mr. B's *Marking out the Bishops of the Establish'd Church as scandalous Non-Residents*; Mr. B. shew'd him, it had no other Foundation than his calling *Non-Residence* a *modern Practice*. And accordingly Mr. B. shew'd him, that *Non-Residence* had been a common Practice in these later degenerate Ages, particularly complain'd of at the Council of *Trent*; nay, shew'd him from Bishop *Burnet's History of the Reformation*, that it was too much in Use among our selves. But that he charg'd none with it but the guilty, nor made any particular Application of it at all to those of the *Establish'd Church*, or indeed of *any other*.

To this Mr. Dr — replies, “ I know that Mr. B. pretends that he spoke of the Non-Residence of Bishops, as a modern Practice with respect to the Practice of the Church of *Rome* before the Council of *Trent*, that is near Two Hundred Years ago. But if this was really and without any Jesuitical Equivocation Mr. B's Meaning, it is so much out of the Road of common *English*, that I dare say none of the Readers of that Sermon understood it so. And we will see what excellent Sense, it will make according to that Interpretation, “ The Apostles haste in going

“ go  
“ all  
“ Bi  
“ Y  
“ ha  
“ ag  
“ I m  
“ a p  
An  
among  
Counc  
ever  
among  
plaint  
was fa  
that T  
since:  
Words  
Mistak  
this,  
“ not  
“ gath  
“ Sen  
“ Par  
“ the  
for se  
Primit  
“ their  
And if  
own U  
ons.  
insist st  
before,  
I shall  
For  
“ Reli  
“ reta  
“ Gov

“ going to *Jerusalem* wou’d not permit his sending to  
 “ all the Parts of *Asia*, to gather together so many  
 “ Bishops in the Modern (i. e. near Two Hundred  
 “ Years ago) Sense, unless we suppos’d ’em to  
 “ have learn’d the Modern (i. e. Two Hundred Years  
 “ ago) Practice, &c. This way of expressing Things  
 “ I’m sure is *Modern*; I dare say Mr. B’s own, and  
 “ a perfect *Original*, &c.

*Answ.* Mr. B. spake of *non-residence* as too common  
 among *Diocesan Bishops*, both several *Ages* before the  
*Council of Trent* ever met; and too common a Practice  
 ever since; nay, (as Dr. Burnet owns) *too much in use*  
*among ourselves too*. And tho’ he mention’d the *com-*  
*plaints* made against it at the *Council of Trent*, yet he  
 was far from thinking that this Abuse had its rise about  
 that Time; or that it has been generally reform’d ever  
 since: And therefore this absurd Paraphrase on Mr. B’s  
 Words is Mr. Dr——’s own, and founded on his own  
 Mistake. And the genuine Paraphrase on ’em shou’d be  
 this, “ The Apostle’s hast in going to *Jerusalem* wou’d  
 “ not permit his sending to all the Parts of *Asia*, to  
 “ gather together so many Bishops in the Modern  
 “ Sense, (i. e. *Diocesan ones*, as oppos’d to the *Primitive*  
 “ *Parish Bishops*) unless we suppose ’em to have learn’d  
 “ the Modern Practice (i. e. the Practice too common  
 for several of these latter Ages, but unknown in the  
 Primitive Times) “ of spending the greatest Part of  
 “ their Time at a distance from their pretended Charge.”  
 And if any interpret ’em otherwise, ’tis the fault of their  
 own Understandings or Wills, not of Mr. B’s Expressi-  
 ons. And therefore if Mr. Dr—— can (as he says)  
*insist still on his Accusation with the same Face as he did*  
*before, without the least blush in his Cheeks for doing so,*  
 I shall not envy his Assurance.

For his next Charge, “ That Mr. B. insinuated, the  
 “ Religion of the Establish’d Church to be corrupt, for  
 “ retaining and justifying the *Diocesan Form of Church*  
 “ *Government*.” I need only desire the Reader to pe-



use Mr. B's Answer to it, *Postscript*, p. 65. and compare it with Mr. Dr——'s pretended *Vindication*; (*Introd.* p. 7.) and shall freely appeal to him, whether he has not plainly trifled in it. Mr. B. had told him, "My Religion as to the *Doctrinal Articles* of it, is the same with that of the *Establiſh'd Church*." And if he think, "That the *Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy* is one of her *Doctrinal Articles*, I do herein differ from him; and shall have occasion under the next Head to shew, that he has not prov'd it to be so.

For that part of his Charge, wherein he saith, Mr. B. had term'd the Members of the *Establiſh'd Church* *degenerate Protestants, and Enemies to the Reformed Religion*. Mr. B. had told him, "That he call'd none degenerate Protestants, but such as confin'd the Catholick Church to the Episcopal Communion; and consequently excluded all those Protestant Churches that want the Diocesan Form of Church Government out of the Catholick Church; reducing them to as hopeless a Condition as that of Infidels.

To this Mr. Dr—— has given an Answer, that I confess is very surprizing.

Mr. B. had mention'd this short Scheme of the Principles of such *degenerate Protestants*, "That there can be no true Sacraments Administred where there is no true Priesthood: That there can be no true Priesthood convey'd without Ordination; that the Power of Ordination belongs to none but Diocesan Bishops: And the Priestly Office can only be conveyed by the Imposition of their Hands. And this conveyance must be in an uninterrupted Line. And consequently, that all the Reformed Churches which are not under Episcopal Government, are without any true Priesthood or Ministry, and without any true Sacraments; and therefore are left to the uncovenanted Mercy of God. So that the Notion of the Catholick Church, cannot extend beyond the bounds of the Episcopal Communion; and those that are not under Episcop

" copal

" cop  
" to i  
" No  
" he  
" to  
" this  
" Est  
" ner  
" Art  
" An  
be abl  
must  
ciples,  
Comm  
ber Pr  
wou'd  
Doctr  
Comm  
Christ  
this E  
Assert  
in the  
met w  
bliſh'd  
so un  
what  
Fir  
" Th  
" Bis  
" not  
" goo  
" Am  
that  
that  
the ſc  
Mini  
out f  
fende

“ copal Government, are excluded from any Relation  
 “ to it.

Now Mr. Dr — tells us, “ That this Character if  
 “ he do not greatly mistake the Matter, must extend  
 “ to every true *Member of the Establish'd Church* in  
 “ this Kingdom. And that every true Member of the  
 “ Establish'd Church must in Mr. B's Sense be a *dege-*  
 “ *nerate Protestant*; unless he renounce the *Thirty nine*  
 “ *Articles*, and his *Common Prayer Book*.

*Answ.* I shou'd be very sorry if Mr. Dr — shou'd  
 be able to prove what he here asserts. For if a Man  
 must either espouse these wretchedly uncharitable Prin-  
 ciples, or renounce the *Thirty nine Articles* and the  
*Common Prayer Book*; it were enough to frighten all so-  
 ber *Protestants* from the Communion of a Church, that  
 wou'd poison all its Members with such *Schismatical*  
*Doctrine* as this: And thus oblige 'em to renounce all  
 Communion with the soundest and purest part of the  
 Christian Church, that is to be found on the Face of  
 this Earth. And if Mr. Dr — cou'd make good his  
 Assertion, he wou'd lay a more insuperable Objection  
 in the way of *Lay Conformity* itself, than any I have yet  
 met with. I will therefore try for once, whether the *Estab-*  
*lish'd Church* may not be vindicated from the Charge of  
 so *uncharitable Principles* as these are; by examining  
 what he alledges in proof of this Assertion.

*First*, He tells us, The *Thirty sixth Article* assures us,  
 “ That the Book of Consecration of Archbishops, and  
 “ Bishops; and ordering of Priests and Deacons has  
 “ nothing in it, that is of itself Superstitious and Un-  
 “ godly.

*Answ.* But how will it hence follow, That because  
 that Book contains nothing *Superstitious* and *Ungodly*,  
 that therefore *Diocesan Bishops* have by *Divine Right*  
 the *sole Power of Ordination*; and there can be no true  
*Ministry*, no true *Sacraments*, and no true Church, with-  
 out such *Episcopal Ordination*? Many celebrated De-  
 fenders of *Episcopacy* own, That no particular *Form of*

Church Government is of *Divine Right*, and therefore plead only for the *lawfulness of Episcopacy*; and their subscribing to this Article, that the *Consecration Book* contains nothing *Superstitious* or *Ungodly*; by no means implies, that all Churches must be unchurch'd that want that particular Form of Government. Mr. Dr—— himself does not think *Archbishops* to be of *Divine Right*; but I hope he does not thereby think he has renounc'd this Article; and that he has charg'd the *Consecration* of 'em as a *Superstitious* and *Ungodly Practice*? And why may not others think the Office of *Bishops* only to be a *lawful Humane Constitution*, and yet with a good Conscience subscribe this Article?

His Second Argument is drawn from the *seventh* and *Eighth Canons* of the *Church of England*, and the *Fourth* of the *Church of Ireland*; which Anathematizes all that say, "*There is any Thing in our Ordinations repugnant to the Word of God.*"

Ans<sup>r</sup>. These Canons are consistent enough with the Opinion of those Divines of the *Establish'd Church*, that think *Diocesan Episcopacy Lawful*, tho' they think it not of *Divine Institution*; and much less tho' they think it not of absolute Necessity to the very Being of the Church. But for the *Charity* of such *Anathemas* as these, I must leave the Vindication of it to Mr. Dr—— himself; for I despair of succeeding in any Attempt that Way.

His Third Argument is from the *Preface* to the *Book of Ordination*, confirm'd by Act of Parliament, which tells us, "'Tis evident to all Men reading the Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostle's Time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; *Bishops*, *Priests* and *Deacons*. And that no Man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon; or suffer'd to execute any of the said Functions, except he be call'd, try'd, examin'd, and admitted thereto, according to the

" Form

" For  
" pif  
An  
Ec.  
been j  
declar  
unalte  
Bishops  
san, o  
Answ  
that A  
is quite  
in his  
tion h  
" of t  
" Lati  
" from  
" vine  
" lamy  
" faith  
" Offic  
" ever  
" ftles  
" whic  
" Chur  
" casio  
" of M  
" Chri  
" whic  
" Divin  
" may  
" in th  
" allow  
How  
ments?  
Establis  
lieve th  
Right;



“ Form hereafter following; or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.

*Ans.* For that *Position*, “ ‘Tis evident to all Men, &c. It only asserts as Matter of *Fact*, *That there have been such Orders from the Apostles time*. But does not declare, That these Three Orders were of *Divine* and *unalterable Right*. Nor does it determine what *kind of Bishops* were from the *Apostle's time*; whether *Diocesan*, or only *Parochial* ones. And if Mr. Calamy's two Answerers may be allow'd to understand the Sense of that *Assertion*, as well as Mr. Dr——, their Judgment is quite opposite to his. For the Reverend Mr. Olliffe, in his Answer to Mr. Calamy, in reference to this Position has these remarkable Words. “ The Proposition “ of this Rubrick is form'd or express'd with as great a “ Latitude and Moderation, as cou'd ever be expected “ from an Episcopal Church. It saith nothing of *Divine Right* or *Appointment*. That is *his* (i. e. Mr. Calamy's) *Addition*, as Mr. Hoadly well observes. It saith nothing of the distinction of their Powers and Offices; or whether they have been every where in every Church or no. But only, that from the Apostles time there have been these *Orders*, &c. From which the most that can be inferr'd is, That in such Churches where there has been need of 'em, or occasion for 'em all, there have been Three such ranks of Ministers for the Government and Instruction of Christ's Church from the Times of the Apostles; which yet by Mr. Calamy's leave, does not prove a *Divine Appointment* of all, (however otherwise it may appear to him;) There having been other things in the *Apostle's Days*, which yet for all that; are not allow'd to be of *Divine Appointment*.

How then shall we reconcile these different Sentiments? Mr. Dr—— thinks that every Member of the Establish'd Church, is oblig'd by this Position to believe the distinct Order of *Episcopacy* to be of *Divine Right*; tho' no Declaration of Assent thereto be requir'd

from the Laity, Mr. Ollyff and Mr. Hoadly tell us, it does not oblige even those Ministers that must declare their *Assent* and *Consent* to all Things contain'd and pre-scrib'd in the *Ordination Book*, to believe any such *Divine Appointment*; and reckon it one of Mr. Calamy's groundless *Objections* against *Conformity* to think otherwise. What shall we do in this Case? If we declare our *Assent*, Mr. Dr—— will charge us with *Insincerity* and *Disimulation*, if we dispute the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*. If we refuse to declare our *Assent*, those two Learned Defenders of the Cause of *Conformity* will reproach us with raising needless scruples, by stretching that *Proposition* in the *Preface* to the *Ordination Book* beyond due bounds; and making it speak more than is really contain'd in it. It seems the safest to forbear, till the Sense of the *Proposition* be determin'd by Authority. Tho' were I to rely either on Mr. Dr——'s Judgment, or Mr. Ollyff's and Mr. Hoadly's, I should not be at any great loss whose to prefer.

For the other part of the *Declaration*, “That no  
“Man shall be accounted, or taken for a lawful Bi-  
“shop, Priest or Deacon; or suffer'd to execute any of  
“the said Functions, except he be call'd, examin'd, or  
“try'd, and admitted thereto, according to the Form  
“hereafter following; or hath had formerly Episcopal  
“Consecration or Ordination.” It plainly refers to the *National Church* of *England*, That they allow no others to be *lawful Bishops*, or *Priests* of that *National Church*, but what are ordain'd according to that *Form*. But does this oblige every Member of that Church, to regard all *Ordinations* either in *Foreign Churches* where the *Diocesan Form* of Government is not establish'd, or in *Dissenting Congregations* at Home, as not only *unlawful*, but even *null* and *void*? If it do not, then there is no Force in Mr. Dr——'s Argument. If it do, then Mr. Dr—— has furnish'd all judicious and charitable Protestants with an unanswerable Objection against the *Establish'd Church*, by

supposing

suppo  
out  
Prim  
so m  
Cath  
speak  
that  
in th  
most  
Quee  
the f  
in th  
have  
Abro  
pal  
neve  
all a  
corre  
wou  
more  
no I  
subj  
“ T  
“ O  
“ fo  
“ ci  
“ p  
“ F  
“ u  
“ v  
“ d  
“ la  
( Se  
ther  
Chu  
F  
Fif  
Mr

supposing that none can be a true *Member* of it, without entertaining such *Uncharitable* and *Schismatical* Principles. For I may well call those so, that cut off so many, and so eminently *Reformed Churches* from the *Catholic Church*. But of this I have had Occasion to speak, when I consider'd what Mr. Dr ——— saith to that Objection against his Pretension of a *Divine Right* in the *Diocesan Form of Government*. And that the most eminent Divines of the Establish'd Church in Queen Elizabeth's, King James's, and I may add, in the succeeding Reigns, never understood these Passages in this rigid Sense, is manifest from the Charity they have all along express'd towards the *Reformed Churches* Abroad, that never had what is now call'd *Episcopal Ordination*, the Ministry of whose Pastors they never have declar'd to be *unlawful* or *null*; but have all along treated them as their *Brethren*, and all along corresponded with them as such. Which sure they would not have done, had they accounted 'em no more than *Laymen*, and look'd on their Churches as no Part of the *Catholic Church*. And I shall only subjoin those remarkable Words of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, "Those that are for Ordination only by a superior Order in the Church, acknowledging a radical Power for Ordination in *Presbyters*, which may be exercised in Case of Necessity, do not think that any positive Law of God hath forbidden *Presbyters* the Power of Ordination. For then it must be wholly unlawful, and so in Case of Necessity, cannot be valid. Which Doctrine I dare with some Confidence assert to be a Stranger to our Church of England, as shall be largely made appear afterwards." (See *Stillingfleet's Irenic*. p. 276.) Whose Judgment then shall we believe concerning the Doctrine of the Church of England, Mr. Dr ———'s or Dr. *Stillingfleet's*?

For the Charge of *condemning the whole Church for Fifteen Hundred Years of Degeneracy and Corruption*, Mr. Dr ——— has said nothing to vindicate himself,



but that he had prov'd the *Primitive Church* to have had the *same Form of Government* as that now call'd *Episcopal*; but how he has prov'd it, I leave to the Reader's Judgment upon what has been said.

For the last Part of his Charge, "That Mr. B. excluded all that were not of his Perswasion, from that Purity that is necessary to every good Christian." Mr. Dr—— pretends it to be a necessary Consequence of what Mr. B. had said. And he thus endeavours to make good the Charge. "He (i. e. Mr. B.) had said, "That his Religion was pure uncorrupted Christianity, in Exclusion of all others who were not of his Perswasion." [This latter Clause by the Way is false, and wholly Mr. Dr——'s own Addition.] "And of Consequence, all others must want that Purity and Incorruption, which if Mr. B. thinks necessary to every good Christian, then what I say of him is grounded on his Assertions. But if he thinks not necessary, he condemns himself of an unpeaceable Spirit for separating from an Establish'd Church in Things not necessary. But however, I suppose Mr. B. will own, that all those who maintain corrupt sinful Terms of Communion, do want that Purity which is necessary. And that this is his Notion of the Establish'd Church, is I think pretty manifest from this *Postscript*." And then he cites these Words of Mr. B's. "I profess to have mental Communion with all those Churches that retain the Essentials of Christianity. And how many such Churches are there, in whom the Essentials of Christianity are mix'd with manifold corrupt Additions to it in Doctrine, Worship, and Practice. And I may exercise such mental Communion with 'em (tho' a very unsound and diseased Part of the Catholick Church) on the Account of what they retain of our common Christianity, when their imposing their corrupt Additions renders my external Communion with 'em impracticable. And for Occasional external Commu-

nion,

“ hion, I can exercise it with many Churches that re-  
 “ tain some Corruptions and Abuses, and are guilty of  
 “ some sinful Divisions, when nothing sinful is enjoined  
 “ in those Acts of Worship wherein I join with them.”

*Answ.* The *Foundation* of this *Charge*, is a very strange  
 Supposition of Mr. Dr——’s, that because Mr. B. saith,  
 “ That pure uncorrupted Christianity is his Religion,”  
 (*i. e.* that he takes no humane Additions to be any  
 Part of it;) That he therefore supposes none can be  
 good *Christians*, that have made any *sinful* or *corrupt*  
*Additions* to our *Religion* as laid down in the *Bible*. If  
 Mr. Dr—— think the *Latter* a necessary Conse-  
 quence of the *Former*, I must needs again tell him,  
 that it looks like the Effect either of *uncommon Ignorance*,  
 or *unaccountable Inadvertency*. If to profess  
 Christianity in its *uncorrupted Simplicity* and *Purity*,  
 were necessary to every good *Christian*, how came the  
 Apostle *Paul* to suppose, that on the same *Foundation*  
 (the *Essentials* of our common Christianity) *some*  
*might build Gold and Silver, and precious Stones, and*  
*some Hay and Stubble, such Work as shou’d be burn’d,*  
*and yet he himself shou’d be saved, (tho with Difficul-*  
*ty, and tanquam ex incendio) yet so as by Fire?*  
 I Cor. III. 11, 12, 13. Does Mr. Dr—— indeed  
 think that every *Error* in *Doctrine*, or every *Corruption*  
 in *Worship*, or every *Abuse* in *Discipline*, that Men by  
 Mistake make a Part of their Religion, does nulli-  
 fy their common *Christianity*? I had thought that  
 the Belief and Practice of the *essential Doctrines* and  
*Duties* of Religion, was all that was necessary to  
 make a Man a good *Christian*. And that those *sinful*  
*Additions* that Men mix with it, are so far pardonable  
 as they spring from *involuntary Ignorance*. Nay, so far  
 as they are consistent with *Sincerity* in their Profession  
 of the fore said *Essentials* of *Faith* and *Holiness*.

But saith Mr. Dr—— “ If M. B. think not such  
 “ Purity and Incorruption necessary to every good  
 “ Christian, he condemns himself of an unpeaceable  
 “ Spirit

“ Spirit, for separating from an Establish’d Church in  
 “ Things not necessary.

*Ans.* If these Words have any Sense at all, the Meaning of ’em must be, That if Mr. B. thinks a Man may be a good *Christian*, tho’ through Ignorance he may take some corrupt humane *Additions* to be a Part of the *Christian Religion*; then he must be inexcusable and guilty of an unpeaceable Spirit, if he separates from any *National Church*, that imposes those *Corruptions* on all her Members, as a Part of their Religion, tho’ he knows and believes them to be *real Corruptions*. And is not this in effect to say, That if Mr. B. do not profess what he believes to be real Errors in a National Church, and comply with what he believes to be sinful Practices, (i. e. Sin against his Conscience) he condemns himself as guilty of an *unpeaceable Spirit*, provided he think those *Errors* and *Corruptions* consistent with Salvation in those that thro’ Ignorance embrace ’em? And can any Proposition in the World be more *unreasonable* and *absurd* than this? Has our Blessed Saviour given any *National Church* on Earth, any Power to impose such corrupt *Additions* to his Holy Religion as the *Terms* of her *Communion*? Or oblig’d all Christians in that Nation to comply with such sinful *Terms*, tho’ they know and believe ’em to be so? Must the Interests of *Truth* and *Holiness*, and of a Man’s own Conscience, be thus sacrific’d on Pretence of *Peace*? Or does not the Charge of *Unpeaceableness* in that Case wholly recoil on the *Imposers*, and the Guilt of the *Division* and *Breach* caus’d by such *Impositions*, lie at their Door? What if a Man think the corrupt *Additions* made by the *Romish Church* to our common *Christianity*, do not utterly *destroy* the *Essentials* of it; (as all those must think, who own the Church of Rome for a *true*, tho’ extremely *degenerate Church*,) will it therefore argue the *Protestant Churches* to be guilty of *Unpeaceableness* in their Separation from her, on the Account



Account of her *imposing* those *Corruptions*? How then, will those that extend their Charity to the Church of *Rome* thus far, be able to justify their *Separation* from it?

But saith Mr. Dr—— “ I suppose Mr. B. will own, that all those who maintain any corrupt sinful Terms of Communion, do want that Purity that is necessary.

*Ans.* If he means that Purity that is necessary to their being good Christians and in a *salvable State*, Mr. B. is so far from owning it, that his Words plainly suppose the contrary. That in some Churches that retain the *Essentials* of Christianity (and consequently have all that is absolutely necessary to their being good Christians, if they live up sincerely to 'em) there may be some *sinful Additions* held and impos'd. With such “ Churches, (saith Mr. B.) I have *mental Communion* indeed (i. e. I esteem 'em as true tho' not pure “ Churches, as I look on a *diseased Man* as a *living Man* tho' not a *sound one*, and approve what they “ retain of our common Christianity) but their *sinful Impositions* render my *external Communion* with “ 'em thro' their *Fault impracticable*. Nay, he may maintain some *occasional Communion* with *Faulty Churches*, in such Acts of Worship wherein no *Sinful Terms* are impos'd, when he cannot maintain a *Total Communion* with 'em. Nor is any Man oblig'd to prefer the *ordinary stated Communion* of a Church that retains many such *Corruptions*, before the *stated Communion* of such Churches as have attain'd a more eminent Degree of *Reformation* and *Purity*.

Since then Mr. Dr——'s *Vindication* of himself, is in every Branch of it so miserably *lame* and *defective*, I must leave it to the Reader to judge, whether the Complement he is pleas'd to bestow on Mr. B. be not more applicable to himself viz. “ That it fares with “ him as it happens to one fallen into a *Bog*: The “ more he strives and struggles to get out of it, the “ dirtier

“ dirtier he makes himself, and the deeper he sinks.”  
**And** let the World judge, Whether his *groundless* and  
*injuriously Accusations*, or Mr. B's gentle *Reproof* of him  
 for 'em deserves to be blam'd ? Or whether Mr. B.  
 have not treated him softly under such Provocations ?  
**I** am sure an ingenuous Retraction of his mistaken  
 Charge wou'd have been much more for his Credit ;  
 and without it, he'll hardly recover it with unbyass'd  
 Readers. And 'tis hard that when he takes this Li-  
 berty of Abusing Mr. B. by such injurious Reflexions,  
 he shou'd with such Assurance impute it to him as a  
*Crime* that he *complains* of 'em.

---

A P.

## APPENDIX II.

SINCE the finishing of the foregoing Treatise, I have perus'd Mr. *Whiston's Four Volumes*, and particularly his *Essay upon the Apostolical Constitutions*, wherein he pretends to prove 'em to be *the most Sacred of the Canonical Books of the New Testament*. And since he produces the *Epistle of Clemens Romanus*, wrote in the Name of the Church at Rome to that at Corinth, as one of his chief *Testimonies* to the *Divine Authority* of those *Constitutions*, I shall add a few *Remarks* thereon, wherein I hope to make it evident, not only that *Clemens* has no Reference in that *Epistle* to any Part of those *Constitutions*, but that no such *Constitutions* were made by the *Apostles*, or known to *Clemens* when he wrote that *Epistle*.

I shall only premise, that as I have already prov'd, That those *Constitutions* mention no other *Bishop* than a *Parochial* or *Congregational* One, so those *Constitutions* themselves give no manner of Countenance to the present *Diocesan Episcopacy*, but utterly overthrow it. And I dispute not the *Divine Right* of such *Parochial Bishops*, but the *Divine Right* of their *Subject-Presbyters*. For I think Dr. *Hammond* entirely in the Right, in his asserting all the *Presbyters* mention'd in the New Testament to be *Bishops* (only he mistakes *Parochial* for *Diocesan* Ones) and that the Churches had no other Officers but *Bishops* and *Deacons*, and that those *Subject-Presbyters* that appear so early under the *Parochial Bishops*, were not of Divine Institution; only I differ from him in his precarious Supposition of their being instituted



instituted by St. *John* after the Death of the other Apostles. They seem rather to have come in (as I have formerly suggested) as *Assistant-Curates* to the *Parochial-Rectors* or *Bishops*, and Candidates of their Pastoral Charge and Care.

But because those *Constitutions* do assert a Difference of Order and Office between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, and assign a peculiar Power to *Bishops*, viz. of *Ordination*, to the Exclusion of *Presbyters* from it; and suppose that those *Presbyters* do by a Divine Right owe Subjection to their (*Parochial*) *Bishops*, I shall consider whether *Clemens Romanus* when he wrote this celebrated *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*, knew any Thing of such an Appointment of Christ by his Apostles, as the first *Five Books of the Constitutions* contain. For if he did not, 'tis evident that he was a Stranger to those *Constitutions* which so confidently bear his Name in the Front of 'em, and which Mr. *Whiston* supposes him to be the *Amanuensis* of the *Apostles* in drawing up.

That I may not misrepresent Mr. *Whiston*, I shall set before the Reader those Inferences he draws from the *Constitutions* relating to Church-Government, p. 705, 707. Sect. V. "Hence we learn, That the Government  
 " of some of the *greatest Churches* was originally by  
 " a *Pastor*, with his Colledge of *Presbyters* and subor-  
 " dinate *Deacons*, and that most of the *lesser Churches*  
 " were at first govern'd under the *Apostles* by a Col-  
 " ledge of *Presbyters*, with their subordinate *Deacons*  
 " only. And that the *Apostles* plac'd *Bishops* over  
 " many of these in their Life-time, and appointed  
 " that the rest shou'd have *Bishops* plac'd over 'em al-  
 " so in due Time afterwards, and all this accord-  
 " ing to Christ's own Direction and Appointment.  
 " Sect. XII. Hence we learn the proper Distinction  
 " and Boundaries of Sacred Offices, particularly, That  
 " *Presbyters* have no Power to *Ordain*, at least in *Epif-*  
 " *copal Churches*. That *Deacons* have no Power either  
 " to consecrate the *Eucharist* or *Baptize*, but are only  
 " to assist the *Bishop* or *Presbyter* in those solemn Mi-  
 nistrations.

“ nistrations. Sect. XIII. Hence we learn the Number  
 “ of the several *Ranks, Orders and Degrees* of Men and  
 “ Women in the Church by the Apostle's Appoint-  
 “ ment, viz. 1. *Bishops*, 2. *Presbyters*, 3. *Deacons* or  
 “ *Ministers*, 4. *Subdeacons* or *Attendants to the Deacons*,  
 “ 5. *Deaconesses*, 6. *Readers*, 7. *Singers*, 8. *Porters*,  
 “ 9. *Virgins*, 10. *Widows*. Besides the *Orphans* and  
 “ *Body of the Laity*.

Let us then compare this with the First Epistle of *Clemens* to the Church at *Corinth*, which Mr. *Whiston* supposes to be wrote about A. D. 69. *Essay*, p. 34. He supposes the *First Five Books and an Half* of the *Constitutions* wrote A. D. 64. when St. Paul was absent from the general Council of the Apostles met on that Occasion. And that there was another Council of the Apostles, A. D. 67. wherein St. Paul was present to confirm the foregoing Writing, and to compose the *Extract* which was to be publish'd to all. See *Essay* p. 29, 30. 'Tis hence evident then, that *Clemens* must have seen this Part of the *Constitutions* before he wrote his fam'd *Epistle* to the Church of *Corinth*. Nay, Mr. *Whiston* cites *Irenæus* as affirming that he had these *Constitutions* all along in his Eye while he wrote that *Epistle* (tho' by the Way, all that *Irenæus* saith, is, That he had the *Preaching* of the Apostles, and the *Tradition* sounding in his Ears, and before his Eyes, which he might have, tho' he had never seen those pretended *Apostolical Constitutions*.)

Now, that *Clemens* knew nothing of these *Apostolical Constitutions*, and much less own'd any such *Books* as a Part of the *Sacred Canon*, will I think appear with convincing Evidence: If I can shew,

I. That Mr. *Whiston* has not brought us the least Proof of his knowing or owning any such *Book* as the *Apostolical Constitutions*.

And II. That the Account which *Clemens* gives in that *Epistle* of the Manner wherein the Apostles settled the Churches, is very inconsistent with the Plan of Church-Government laid down in those *Constitutions*.

And

And if both these be made good, the Pretension of their *Divine Authority* as a Part of the *Sacred Canon* falls to the Ground.

I. Mr. *Whiston* has not in all his Citations from this *Epistle of Clemens* (penn'd after the Writing of these *Constitutions*.) brought us any one convincing Proof that he ever knew or own'd any such *Book*, and much less as dictated by the Apostles.

I have taken the Pains to run thro' all his Citations from *Clemens*, and to compare 'em with those Passages in the *Constitutions* that he supposes *Clemens* to refer to; and I cannot find that he does in one of 'em name any such *Book* as these *Constitutions*, or produce one Passage out of it to authorize and warrant any one *Assertion*, or any one *Exhortation* he delivers. As he frequently cites other Passages from the known *Writers* of what we call the *New Testament*, tho' there was all possible Reason he shou'd do it, if he took this *Writing* (suppos'd to be compos'd by the Direction of all the Apostles) to be the most sacred Part of the *New Testament*. Nor do I find that he cites *verbatim*, any one Passage contain'd in those pretended *Apostolical Constitutions*, as he most carefully does what he produces from the *Writings* of any *Evangelist*, or any particular *Inspir'd Apostle*.

He tells us indeed, when he cites that Passage in *Clemens*, *Let us come to the glorious and venerable Rule* [ *Κανὼν* ] of our holy Profession, that *Κανὼν* or Rule was one Name for the *Constitutions*. But has he produc'd the least Proof from *Clemens* or any ancient *Writer*, that *Κανὼν* signify'd these *Constitutions*? May he not as well tell us, That St. *Paul* meant these *Constitutions* when he exhorts the *Philippians*, as far as they had attain'd to walk by the same Rule [ *Κανὼν* ] *Phil. III. 16.*

So when he cites that Passage in *Clemens*, *Seet. XIII.* "By this Command and these Rules let us establish  
"our selves, that so we may always walk obediently  
"to his holy Words, he tells, That *Ἐντολαὶ* and *πα-*

*ἐγγέλματα*



ἐγγράμματα are two Names of those Constitutions. But as this is his meer precarious Assertion without the least Proof for it, so 'tis manifest to any Man that peruses that short Section in *Clemens*, that he refers to those Rules of the Holy Scripture (*viz* Jer. IX. 23. 1 Cor. IX. 21. Luke IV. 36.) which he had just before cited. This was the Ἐπιστολὴ and the τὰ παλαιὰ ἐγγράμματα that *Clemens* refers to, not any Apostolical Constitutions which Mr. *Whiston* supposes him to be the Penman of.

So when he cites those Words Sect. XIX. "Having therefore so many and so great and glorious Examples before us, let us return to that Peace which was the Mark that from the Beginning was set before us." He tells us, this Mark was the Constitutions deliver'd just after Christ's Resurrection. But will any impartial Reader, whose Mind is not blinded with a prejudicate Fondness for his own Opinion, ever imagine that *Clemens* intended by these Words to refer to so considerable a Book as this, which he no where once mentions, no where once recommends to us on the Account of it's Apostolical Authority and Inspiration? May he not as well persuade us, that the Apostle Paul had these Constitutions in his Eye, when he exhorts the Philippians to press forwards towards the Mark for the Prize of their High-Calling, which is of God in Christ, Phil. III. 14.

Thus when *Clemens* exhorts the Corinthians, Sect. XXXVII. "To march on (or manage their Warfare) with all Earnestness in his Holy Laws" He tells us, Περαιγμάτα was one Name of the Constitutions. But does he bring the least Proof of it, or of *Clemens* owning any such Book under that Name, or citing one Command out of it, as a Command of Christ deliver'd in such a Book by the Apostles, as he does when he cites any Precept from a Writer of the New Testament? How manifestly does this Gentleman in such precarious Suppositions ἀελοῦν τὴν ἀποδείξιν?

So when *Clemens*, Sect. XL. exhorts the *Corinthians*,  
 " To do all Things in Order (τάξις) and faith, that they  
 " who make their Offerings at the appointed Seasons  
 " are happy and accepted, because that obeying  
 " the Commandments of the Lord, they sin not :  
 " He tells us that τάξις was one Name of the *Con-*  
 " *stitutions*, and so was Νόμιμα τῷ Δεσπότῃ". But does  
 he think that any Man of Sense will upon his bare  
 Word, believe that this *Book* of the *Constitutions* was  
 meant by these Words of *Clemens*, when there is not  
 the least Shadow of Probability for it, when there is  
 not one *Citation* from the *Book* at all, and much less  
 under the Character of an *inspired Book*, to countenance  
 such a Supposition ?

The same Observation may be made of his next  
*Citation*, Sect. XLI. *Clemens* exhorts 'em, " To blefs  
 " God every one in his own Station with a good  
 " Conscience, and with all Gravity, not exceed-  
 " ing the *Rule* of his Service that is appointed to him."  
 [τὸν ἀεισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτῆς κέροντα] And here Mr. *Whi-*  
*ston* tells us, That Κανὼν τῆς λειτουργίας was the Name of  
 one Part of the *Constitutions*. But what Proof does he  
 produce, That *Clemens* ever thought or heard of any  
*Book* that went under that Name ? Or that he refers  
 to any other *Rule* or *Service*, than what the *New*  
*Testament* as we now have and own it, prescribes ? Ne  
 quē quidem.

The same is to be said of that Passage he cites from  
*Clemens*, " Let him that loves Christ, keep his Com-  
 mandments. [Παραγγέλλουσα.]

In short, if we run thro' the whole of his *Citations*,  
 we shall never once find any *entire Paragraph* of these  
 pretended *Constitutions* recited as the Words of the  
*Apostles*, tho' he constantly does so, when he cites the  
 Words of any *inspired Writer* of the *New Testament*.

'Tis true indeed, That *Clemens* alledges the same  
 Story of the *Phoenix*, as a Proof of the *Resurrection*  
 that we find in the *Apostolical Constitutions*. But as  
 he no where cites any *Christian Author* for it, much  
 less

less the *Apostles* of Christ; so the *Story* is not only told in very different Expressions, but with several material Circumstances in *Clemens* that are not found in the *Constitutions*; as particularly, "That the new *Phoenix* takes up the Nest in which the Bones of its Parent lye, and carries it from *Arabia* into *Ægypt* to a City called *Heliopolis*; and flying in open Day in Sight of all Men, lays it on the *Altar* of the *Sun*, and so returns from whence it came." Now since *Clemens* pretends to no *inspired Author* for the Credit of this *Story*; since all Men of Judgment are satisfied, that the *Story* it self is *fabulous*, 'tis much more probable that the spurious *Author* of the *Constitutions* may have borrow'd it from *Clemens* (as other later Christian Writers have done) than *Clemens* from him. Especially when 'tis not agreeable to the Character of *inspired Persons*, to support that *Doctrine* of the *Resurrection* (the Truth whereof solely depends on Divine Revelation) by such *fabulous Relations* as this.

What mention *Clemens* makes of the *Works of Creation*, Sect. XX. is so entirely different in Expressions from the Passages Mr. *Whiston* refers us to in the *Constitutions*, that there is no appearance of the *Former* being borrowed from the *Later*. He may as well argue, that *David* had those *Apostolical Constitutions* before him, when he penn'd the 104th and the 119th *Psalms*.

The same may be said of Sect. XXXIV. compar'd with what occurs in the *Constitutions* concerning the *Holy Angels*.

In short, after diligently comparing all the *Passages* in *Clemens*, which he supposes to be parallel to those in the *Constitutions*, I find not one Paragraph wherein the Expressions are the same: Nor any wherein their Agreement in the like Sentiments may not be accidentally without the *Writings* of the one being seen by the other; Nor any Thing that shou'd convince an unprejudic'd Mind that *Clemens* shou'd borrow his



Reasonings from the *Constitutions* rather than the *Author* of the *Constitutions* from him.

Now if *Clemens* had these *Constitutions* before him, and knew 'em to have been compos'd by the *Apostles* themselves, what tolerable Reason can Mr. *Whiston* give, why he never mentions such a *Book* and the *inspired Authors* of it? Why he never cites *one entire Paragraph* out of it, as he does so many out of the several *inspired Writings* of the *New Testament* which we have? Why he never once makes use of so sacred and venerable an *Authority* as that of a *Council* of the *Apostles*, to repress this dangerous *Schism* at *Corinth*, and confound the turbulent *Authors* of it? He recommends indeed to 'em *Paul's Epistle* directed to 'em, but never takes Notice of this *more sacred Book*, wherein the Joint-Authority of all the *Apostles* was so conspicuous, and which must have carried more Weight in it than the Writing of any *single Apostle*. This I think carries with it a far stronger Presumption that he knew of no such *Book*, than a meer imaginary *Agreement*, or *Similitude* of a few *Passages* that can scarce fail to occur in any Writers in so plain and obvious Subjects, does to the contrary.

But from this *Negative Argument*, I proceed to a more *positive one*, viz.

II. To shew, that the Account which *Clemens* gives us in this undoubted Epistle of his, of the *Manner* wherein the *Apostles* settled the *Churches*, is very inconsistent with the *Plan* of *Church-Government* laid down in the *Constitutions* that are suppos'd to be written before it.

The Account which *Clemens* gives, we have *Sect. XLII.*

"The *Apostles* have preached to us from our Lord  
 "Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God. Christ there-  
 "fore was sent by God, the *Apostles* by Christ. So  
 "both were orderly sent according to the Will of  
 "God. For having receiv'd their Command, and  
 "being

“ being throughly assur’d by the Resurrection of our  
 “ Lord Jesus Christ, and convinc’d by the Word of  
 “ God, and the fulness of the Holy Spirit, they went  
 “ Abroad publishing that the Kingdom of God was  
 “ at Hand. And thus preaching thro’ the Countries  
 “ and Cities, they appointed their First-Fruits, to be  
 “ Bishops and Deacons of such as shou’d after believe,  
 “ having first proved them by the Spirit. Nor was  
 “ this any new Thing, since long before it was writ-  
 “ ten concerning Bishops and Deacons : For thus  
 “ saith the Scripture in a certain Place, I will ap-  
 “ point their Bishops in Righteousness, and their Dea-  
 “ cons in Faith.

Compare with this what *Clemens* saith *Señ. XLIV.*

“ So likewise our Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus  
 “ Christ, that there shou’d Contentions arise [*Ἐν τῷ*  
 “ *ὀνόματι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*] about the Name (or on the Ac-  
 “ count) of Episcopacy. For this Cause having a per-  
 “ fect Fore-knowledge, they constituted the aforesaid  
 “ Persons, [i. e. *Bishops* and *Deacons*,] and then gave  
 “ Direction how when they should die, other chosen  
 “ and approved Men shou’d succeed in their Ministry  
 “ (or Ministration, *Διεύθυναν*;) therefore we cannot  
 “ think that those may be justly thrown out of their  
 “ Ministry, who were either appointed by them, or  
 “ chosen afterwards by approved Men, and who have  
 “ with all Lowliness and Innocence ministred to the  
 “ Flock of Christ, in Peace and without Sch-interest,  
 “ and were for a long Time commended by all. For  
 “ it wou’d be no small Sin in us, shou’d we cast those  
 “ out of their *Episcopacy* (or *Episcopal Office*, *τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*)  
 “ who have in an holy and blameless Manner fulfill’d  
 “ the Duties of it. Blessed are those *Presbyters* who  
 “ having finish’d their Course before these Times,  
 “ have obtain’d a fruitful and perfect Dissolution. For  
 “ they have no Fear least any one shou’d turn them  
 “ out of the Place appointed for ’em : But we see how  
 “ you have put out some who liv’d reputably among



“ you from the Ministry, which they had unblameably adorn’d.

Compare with this *Sect. XLVII.* “ ’Tis a Shame, my Beloved, yea, a very great Shame, and unworthy of your Christian Profession, to hear that the most firm and ancient Church of the *Corinthians*, shou’d by one or two Persons be led into a Sedition against its *Presbyters*.

*Sect. LIV.* “ Only let the Flock of Christ be in Peace with the *Presbyters* that are set over it.

*Sect. LVII.* “ Do ye therefore who laid the first Foundation of this Sedition, submit your selves unto your *Presbyters*.

I need not with respect to Mr. *Whiston* insist on what I have already prov’d, That this Church of *Corinth* at the writing of this *Epistle* was under the Government of *Presbyters*, and had no single Person then among ’em under the Title of *Bishop*, that pretended to any *Jurisdiction* or *Government* over these *Presbyters*. For this Mr. *Whiston* freely grants, “ That the Settlement of Churches under *Bishops*, as distinguish’d from, and constituted in a superior Order to *Presbyters*, was not yet begun in the Church of *Corinth*, nor *Philippi*, nor perhaps *Thessalonica*; and at *Philippi*, not till *A.D. 116.* *Essay* p. 231.

Let us now compare this Account that *Clemens* gives of the Manner wherein the Apostles settled the Churches they planted, with what the Author of the *Constitutions* tells us, they unanimously determin’d concerning the Form of Church-Government, pursuant to the Commands they had received from Christ himself, during his Forty Days Converse with ’em after the Resurrection.

If we trace the first *Five Books* of the *Constitutions*, we find a clear Distinction in Office and Authority, between the *Bishop* and his *Presbyters*. “ The *Bishop* sustains the Character of God among Men, he is set over all Men, over Priests, Kings, Rulers, Fathers, Children, Masters, and in general over all those  
subject



" subject to him. *Const. L. II. c. 11.* He is intrusted  
 " with the Souls of all that pertain to his Flock, *L. II.*  
 " *c. 14. 15, &c.* He is entrusted with distributing all their  
 " Oblations and Gifts, *L. II. c. 25.* He is the Mini-  
 " ster of the Word, the Keeper of Knowledge, the Me-  
 " diator between God and his People in the several Parts  
 " of their Divine Worship. He is the Teacher of Piety;  
 " and next after God, their Father. He is their [Ἀρχὴν]  
 " Ruler and Governor, their King and [Δυναστεύς] Po-  
 " tentate. He is next after God, their Earthly God.  
 " He is one honour'd with the Authority of God, which  
 " he is to exercise over the Clergy, and by which he is to  
 " govern all the People, &c. *L. II. c. 26.* He is  
 " the High-Priest, *L. II. c. 27.* The Presbyters who  
 " labour in Word and Doctrine, sustain the Place of the  
 " Apostles, as the Bishop's Counsellors, and the Crown  
 " of the Church, *L. II. c. 28.* His Priestly Office is be-  
 " yond the Kingly, *L. II. c. 34.* The Presbyters and  
 " Deacons were to sit as Assessors with the Bishop in their  
 " Judicatories every Second Day of the Week, *L. II.*  
 " *c. 47.* The Presbyters sat in the Church on each Side  
 " of the Bishop's Throne, the Presbyters exhorting the  
 " People one by one, and the Bishop in the last Place as  
 " the Commander. The Bishop as the High-Priest offering  
 " the Eucharistical Sacrifice, *L. II. c. 57.*

*L. III. c. 11.* " Neither Readers, Singers, Porters, nor  
 " [ὑποδιακόνες] Ministers (probably Subdeacons) nor Dea-  
 " cons are allow'd to baptize. Nor are Presbyters al-  
 " low'd to ordain the inferior Officers, but only the  
 " Bishop. And *c. 20.* The Bishop is to be ordain'd  
 " by three Bishops, whereas a Presbyter or Deacon are  
 " to be ordain'd by one Bishop, and neither Presbyter  
 " nor Deacon must ordain; all that belong'd to the  
 " Presbyters Office being to teach, offer, baptize, and  
 " bless the People, the Deacon ministring both to Bi-  
 " shop and Presbyter therein.

And L. VIII. c. 46. The Apostles are introduc'd as saying, "That being taught by the Lord the Series of Things, they distributed the Functions of the High Priesthood to the Bishops, those of the Priesthood to the Presbyters, and the Ministration under them both to the Deacons, that the Divine Worship may be perform'd in Purity. For 'tis not lawful for a Deacon to offer the Sacrifice or Baptize, or give the greater or lesser Blessing. Nor may a Presbyter perform Ordination. Nay, the Apostles are introduc'd in the same Chapter, as telling us, That after Christ's Ascension, they ordain'd Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons.

We see then by these Constitutions, the Office of a Bishop is suppos'd to be constituted by the Apostles as distinct from that of Presbyters, as vested with an Authority far superior to theirs which they ow'd a Subjection to, and to which at least the Power of Ordination peculiarly belong'd, and all this (as Mr. Whiston supposes) before the Writing of this Epistle.

Let us now see, how we can reconcile this with the Account which Clemens gives us of what was practis'd by the Apostles in the Settlement of the Churches they planted.

Clemens tells us, That the Apostles when they had converted a competent Number to the Faith, did from the First-Fruits of their Labours appoint Bishops and Deacons among them, and order'd that upon their Death, other approved Men shou'd succeed in their Ministration. If Presbyters were then a distinct Order from these Bishops, what Account can Mr. Whiston give why he shou'd never mention 'em, and that in an Epistle wherein he pleads the Cause of the ejected Presbyters of Corinth? If both their Office and Names were already distinguish'd by the Apostles, how comes he to charge the Church of Corinth for casting their Presbyters out of their Episcopal Office? Nay, how comes he to suppose those Presbyters that had obtain'd an happy Dissolution, to be such Bishops as the Apostles had, together with Deacons, constituted

in

in every Church in the Countries and Cities where they had preach'd? Nay, since the Constitution of this Church, if it had only these *inferior Presbyters* to preside in it, was extreamly *lame and defective*, as wanting their *High-Priest* to govern these *inferior Priests*, and the *Laity* under them; Why does he never take Notice of this palpable *Defect*, and recommend to them the Choice of a *Bishop*, especially when their present *Divisions* rendred such a *Bishop* so necessary as the *Centre of Unity* among 'em? Nay, how comes he to pass over in entire Silence these *inferior Offices* of *Subdeacons*, *Readers*, *Porters*, *Singers*, that make up the rest of the *Bishops Clergy*? Can any Thing be more unaccountable than his *Discourse* on this Subject appears, on Supposition that he had before the writing this Epistle, seen and known this *Book of Apostolical Constitutions*?

If it be here said, That *Clemens* mentions the *three Orders* among the *Jews* of *High-Priest*, *Priests*, and *Levites*; 'tis true, but I have already shewn, he never applies that Comparifon to a *Christian Church* (unless it be to the *Catholick Church* of which he asserts *Christ* to be the *High-Priest*.) But on the contrary, mentions no other *Officers* appointed in *particular Churches*, (whether in *Cities* or *Countries*) but *Bishops* and *Deacons*, and supposes the *Bishop's Office* to belong to these *Presbyters*, of whose unjust Ejection he complains. And therefore 'tis evident, That those *later Writers*, and particularly the *Author* of these *Constitutions*, have *mistaken* or *perverted* the Intent of these Words of *Clemens* concerning these *three Orders* in the *Jewish Church*, when they apply it to these three Orders of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons* in every *particular Church*, of which *Clemens* is not only Silent, but saith what is manifestly *inconsistent* therewith.

And this Argument will appear the more clear and convincing, if we compare this Account that *Clemens* gives of the common Practice of the *Apostles*, with what occurs in the *Acts* and in *St. Paul's Epistles*. In  
the



the *Acts* we read, that the *Apostles* ordain'd *Elders* in every Church, *Acts* XIV. 23. The *Elders* constituted in the Church of *Ephesus*, are not only called the *Bishops* of it, but have the Government of that Flock committed to 'em, when the *Apostle Paul* took his last Farewel of 'em, as never like to see their Faces any more, *Acts* XX. 17. 28, 38. And that *St. Paul* ever made *Timothy* their *Bishop*, as superior to those *Presbyter-Bishops*, I have sufficiently disprov'd. Nay, I may leave it to Mr. *Whiston's* Conscience, when he considers the laborious Work enjoin'd the *Bishops* by these *Constitutions*, whether it was possible for *Timothy* to discharge it, whose stay at *Ephesus* was so short and temporary, and whose executing such a stated Office in that Church was so inconsistent with his *itinerant Ministry*.

Add to this, That *Clemens's* Account of the Officers constituted by the *Apostles* in every Church, is exactly Parallel to the 1 *Tim.* III. where only two such Offices of *Bishops* and *Deacons* are mention'd, and the *Qualifications* of such as shou'd discharge 'em describ'd. And 'tis no less agreeable to the *Apostles* Direction to *Titus*, to ordain *Elders* in every City or Town in *Crete*, which *Elders* are dignify'd with the Title of *Bishops*, *Tit.* I. 6, 7.—and the Office and Name implied to be the same. If *St. Paul* by the *Bishops*, whose Office and *Qualifications* he describes, 1 *Tim.* III. meant *Presbyters* as an inferior Order, how comes he to pass over the *Episcopal* Order in entire Silence, and give no Directions about it? Nay, how comes he that was directed by the same Spirit with the rest of the *Apostles*, to constitute *Presbyters* as *Priests* in every Church, without setting One as *High-Priest* over 'em? How comes he to give this distinguishing Name of a superior Order to 'em? If he meant *Bishops* as an higher Order, how comes he so exactly to describe the *Qualifications* of an inferior Order, viz. That of *Deacons*, and pass over the superior Order of *Presbyters* in so profound Silence? Did he take it for an unnecessary or superfluous one, that

that he gives no *Direction* about it? We see then *St. Paul* and *Clemens* perfectly agree in the *two Orders* of *Bishops* and *Deacons* constituted in every Church, and in making the *Presbyters* and *Bishops* the same both in *Name*, and *Office*, and *Qualifications*. Both agree in their *Silence* about any *inferior Order*. Both therefore were entire Strangers to these pretended *Apostolical Constitutions*, that make so manifest a Distinction between the *Office* of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, and that add so many new ones of *Subdeacons*, *Readers*, *Singers*, &c. to make up with a Sort of *inferior* and *Subject-Presbyters* the *Clergy* of the *Parochial Bishop*. And consequently these *Constitutions* must be of a far later Date than the *Epistle* of *Clemens*, and penn'd after the *Priestly Office*, (as tis call'd) was subdivided into that of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, as the *Ministring Office* was into that of *Deacons* and *Subdeacons*; and the *Readers*, *Singers*, and *Porters* adopted into the Number of the *Clergy*, as distinguish'd from the *Laitie*. And thus the pretended *Amanuensis* of these pretended *Apostolical Constitutions*, proves an irrefragable *VVitness* of their being only a *spurious* Composure of some later *VVriter*.

It were as easy to shew him, that *Ignatius* was an utter Stranger to these *Constitutions*, who never mentions any such *Book*. And that as to all the truly parallel Passages he compares in *Ignatius's* *Epistles* with some in the *Constitutions*; 'tis far more probable, that the Author of these *Spurious Constitutions* has borrow'd 'em from *Ignatius*, than *Ignatius* from him. For tho' *Ignatius's* *Epistle* distinguish his *Parochial Bishop* from his *Parish Presbyters*, yet they mention nothing of his *Subdeacons*, the *Deacon's* *Office* not being then subdivided.

And the same might be said as to *Polycarp's* *Epistle* to the *Philippians*, who mentions no other *Officers* in that Church but *Presbyters* and *Deacons* (parallel to the *Presbyter-Bishops* and *Deacons* mentioned by *Clemens* at *Corinth*) to whom he exhorts 'em to be subject as to *God* and *Christ*. But of these pretended *Apostolical*

*lical Constitutions* he speaks not one Syllable, tho' if that Church wanted an *High-Priest* so long, 'tis unaccountable he shou'd never advise 'em to get one constituted among 'em.

But because the Examination of these *Testimonies* is foreign to my present Subject; and I doubt not some learned *Antiquary* that has more leisure to trace the Footsteps of genuine Antiquity, will undertake the Detection of this spurious Piece, which this Gentleman wou'd thus confidently impose upon us for the most sacred Part of the New Testament, I shall not pursue this Enquiry any farther at present.

I wou'd only before I quit this Subject desire Mr. *Whiston* who so magnifies these *Apostolical Constitutions*, and even the *Apostolical Canons* themselves as inspired *Books*, to answer a few plain *Questions* which my present Subject leads me to ask him.

Q. I. Where he finds any inspired *Writer* of the New Testament, speak of *Bishops* in a Strain that carries so strong a Savour of nauseous Arrogance and Pride as the *Apostolical Constitutions* do? Where do they tell us, That the *Bishop sustains the Character of God among Men*; That he is set over all Men, even Kings and Rulers; That he is their *Ruler* (*'Αρχων*) and King, and Potentate, and next after God their *Earthly God*? How does this high-flown Language agree with our Saviour's rebuking his Disciples for their Contest, who shou'd be greatest? Or with his declaring their Office to be not a *Domination* but a *Ministry*? How shall we reconcile it with St. Paul's Precept, that requires every Soul (the Clergy as well as Laity) to be subject to the higher Powers? How dissonant is such Language from all the Examples of *Humility* which the *Apostles* themselves have given us? Nay, how much more suitable to those proud *Popes* that have so long endeavour'd to exalt the *Mitre* above the *Crown*, and to that *Man of Sin* that sitting in the Temple of God, exalts himself above all that is call'd God and worshipp'd, than to a plain *Parochial Bishop*? One wou'd think

Mr. *Whiston*



Mr. *Whiston* shou'd at least suspect such Passages as these, to be *Interpolations* that owe themselves to some aspiring *Bishop* of *Rome*. And 'tis perhaps from these *Constitutions* that *Hildebrand* borrow'd his Sentiments, when he preferr'd the *Papal* so much before the *Imperial* Power : For they prefer the *Episcopal* to the *Royal* Authority.

Q. II. Why Mr. *Whiston* was never so candid, as to distinguish this *Parochial Episcopacy* mention'd in these *Constitutions* and in *Ignatius's* *Epistles*, from that *Diocesan Episcopacy* that for so many Ages has overturn'd and swallowed it up, turning some Scores or Hundreds of such *Parochial Bishops* into meer *Subject-Presbyters*, to make up the Power and Grandure of one *Diocesan*.

Q. III. If Mr. *Whiston* supposes these *Apostolical Canons* to be of *Divine Inspiration*, whether they do not subject all those *Bishops* thro' the *Christian World*, that owe their Advancement to the *Nomination* and *Interest* of *Secular Rulers*, to the Sentence of *Excommunication*; nay, all those of the *Laity* that are in *Communion* with them? And consequently, how few true *Apostolical Bishops* have been for several Ages to be found in the *Christian Church*, if we allow not those *Parochial Rectors* or *Pastors* of particular *Congregations* to be such, that go under the Name of *Presbyters*, and whose *Ordinations* so many on that Account have the Confidence to pronounce null and void? And whether Mr. *Whiston* does not confirm their rash Censure with respect to those he calls *Episcopal Churches*? *Essay* p. 707.

Q. IV. Whether Mr. *Whiston* can reconcile that *Doctrine* in these pretended *Apostolical Constitutions* that forbids any of the *Clergy* that are *unmarried* at their *Ordination* to marry afterwards, with the *Doctrine* of the inspired *Writers* of the *New-Testament* that assert *Marriage to be honourable in all*, *Heb. XIII. 4.* and oblige all to marry that have not the *Gift of Continency* (without any Exception of *Clergy* or *Laity*),  
1 Cor.

1 Cor. VII. 9. And that make the Prohibition of *Marriage*, one Character of the *Authors* of the *Grand Apostacy* of the latter Days, 1 Tim IV. 1, 2, 3.

2. V. Whether Mr. *Whiston* can find any Thing in our *New Testament*, to countenance such *Consecrations* of *Holy Oil* as these pretended *Constitutions* prescribe, and which look so like *Magical Incantations*?

As my Subject does not lead me thereto, so I shall not at present enter on any Examination of the *Ancient Writers*, whom Mr. *Whiston* wou'd press into the Service of the *Arian Cause*.

I shall only suggest one Argument to him that seems to overthrow his Cause. He owns our *Blessed Saviour* to be the *Maker* of this *material World*, and accordingly fairly interprets those numerous Passages of Scripture, that ascribe the *Creation*, to him, in their plain and literal Sense. And yet he plainly supposes him to be a *created Being*, and stiffly denies his *Coeternal Existence* with the *Father*. Now, I know not how to reconcile this with the Force of the Apostles Argument, that supposes this *visible Creation* to be a demonstrative Proof of its *Maker's Eternal Power and Godhead*, Rom. I. 20. The Argument must be *lame and inconclusive* on his Principles, who supposes that this *Creation* may be owing to a *Being* that has neither the *Eternity*, nor the *unlimited Power* that belong to the *Deity*. But as I doubt not, that others far more capable will particularly examine his *Scheme* of the *Primitive Faith*, and the *Authorities* he has alledg'd to countenance it, so I shall no farther *falcem meam in alienam Messem immittere*.

I am desir'd by a Friend of Mr. *Whiston's* to subjoin one Question more to him, viz. he tells us *Vol. I. p. 72, 73*. How earnestly he solicited by Letter the Reverend Mr. *Shute* of *St. Andrews Parish*, to admit him to the Participation of the Holy Eucharist in the Parish-Church, and how desirous he was of continuing

in

in the Communion of the Church of *England*. Now my Friend wou'd gladly know upon what Principles he acts in desiring Communion with an Eftablish'd Church, whose Litany as well as Creed is so directly opposite and contradictory to his own? and who (he knows) requires strictly Divine Worship to be paid to that Blessed Saviour, to whom Mr. *Whiston* must account it an Idolatrous Practice to pay it? For if there be any such Thing as Idolatry in the World, 'tis the giving truly and strictly Divine Worship to a Being to which the incommunicable Perfections of the Divine Nature do not belong. And others of his Friends are highly concern'd in resolving the same Question.

---

## F I N I S.

---

The Third Edition.  
 under each Head. By *Mary Henry*, Minister of the Gospel at *Chesham*.  
 A Method for Perusing with Scripture Expressions, proper to be used  
 Year 1707. By her Son.  
 of the Death of his Pious Relict Mrs. *Ann* Henry, in the  
 Third Edition; in which is added a Sermon preached on Occasion  
 in the 6th Year of his Age. With Dr. *Henry's* Dedication. The  
 the Gospel, near 1600 Years in Spanish. Who died June 24, 1685.



**BOOKS Printed for John Lawrence, at the Angel  
in the Poultry.**

**R**emarks on a late Discourse of *William Lord Bishop of Derry*, concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God. Also, a Defence of the said Remarks, against his Lordship's Admonition. By *J. Boyse*. 8°.

The History of Images, and of Image Worship. Shewing the Original and Progress of Idolatry among Pagans, Jews, and Christians: With a Refutation of the Second Council of *Nice*, and of other Advocates for Idolatry. By the late Reverend Mr. *James Owen*.

Mr. *James Pearce's* Remarks on Dr. *Wells's* Letters to Mr. *Peter Dowley*, and to a Dissenting Parishioner, with his several Defences of those Remarks, wherein the Doctor's Writings against the Dissenters are fully consider'd. in Eight Letters, also some Considerations on the Sixth Chapter of the Abridgment of the *London Cases*; containing a Vindication of the Office of Baptism, and particularly of the Sign of the Cross, with a Postscript to Dr. *Wells's*. In 8°.

A Letter from some *Aged Nonconforming Ministers*, to their Christian Friends, touching the Reasons of their Practice. The Third Edition, Corrected and Enlarged, with some Practical Advice. 8°.

Dr. *Sherlock's* Cases and Letter of Church Communion (lately summ'd up in the Abridgment of the *London Cases*) consider'd: And the Dissenters vindicated from the Charge of *Schism*. By Mr. *Nath. Taylor*. 8°.

**BOOKS Printed for N. Cliff and D. Jackson, at the  
Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside.**

**M***ethodus Evangelica*: Or a Modest Essay upon the true Scriptural-Rational Way of Preaching the Gospel. Being some Discourses upon the Homilitical, Textual, and Occasional Method of Preaching: Together with an Appendix concerning Lecturing, and an Account of the Matter, Dialect, and Frame, conceived to be most proper for Gospel Sermons. The Whole being design'd to point out the great Seriousness and Wisdom, which especially at this Day are so necessary towards Preaching and Adorning the glorious Gospel. By *Tho. Blackwell*, SS. Th. P.

An Account of the Life and Death of Mr. *Philip Henry*, Minister of the Gospel, near *Whitchurch* in *Shropshire*. Who died *June 24. 1696.* in the 65th Year of his Age. With Dr. *Bates's* Dedication. The Third Edition; in which is added a Sermon preach'd on Occasion of the Death of his Pious Relict Mrs. *Katharine Henry*, in the Year 1707. By her Son.

A Method for Prayer with Scripture Expressions, proper to be used under each Head. By *Matth. Henry*, Minister of the Gospel at *Chester*. The Third Edition.